DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 559 CS 012 747

AUTHOR	Commeyras, Michelle; And Others
TITLE	Literacy Professionals' Ways of Knowing: A National Survey. Reading Research Report No. 86.
INSTITUTION	National Reading Research Center, Athens, GA.; National Reading Research Center, College Park, MD.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	97
CONTRACT	117A20007
NOTE	165p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; Interprofessional Relationship; Literacy; National Surveys; Portfolio Assessment; *Professional Development; *Reading Teachers; *Student Motivation; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	Book Clubs; Teaching Research

ABSTRACT

A study assessed how literacy professionals acquire knowledge as well as what knowledge they possess and value. A questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of K-12 teachers, reading specialists, administrators, library-media specialists, and teacher educators in the United States. Results were based on 1,519 responses and are discussed in terms of knowing through professional development (reading professional literature, teacher education, and teacher research) and knowing about three current pedagogical topics (book clubs, portfolio assessment, and motivation). Results indicated that literacy professionals: (1) read practitioner journal articles, books, and professional newspapers more often than research journals or electronic sources; (2) believe that collaborative experiences between mentor teachers, student teachers, and teacher educators were important, but many of them have had little experience with such collaborations; (3) were familiar with teacher research, were interested in becoming teacher researchers, and found their practices influenced by teacher research; (4) agree that book clubs were a valuable form of pedagogy, but most have not had such experiences themselves and fewer still have had experiences with book clubs in which multicultural literature was read; (5) had knowledge, experience, and interest in portfolio assessment, but did not agree that portfolios should replace other forms of assessment; and (6) found intrinsic indicators of motivation to be more meaningful than extrinsic indicators. (Contains 118 references. An appendix presents 23 tables of data.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 405 559

Literacy Professionals' Ways of Knowing: A National Survey

Michelle Commeyras
Linda DeGroff
Randi Stanulis
University of Georgia

Karen Hankins
Clarke County Schools and
University of Georgia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS 012 747

NRRC
National
Reading Research
Center

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 86
Winter 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NRRC

National Reading Research Center

Literacy Professionals' Ways of Knowing: A National Survey

Michelle Commeyras
Linda DeGroff
Randi Stanulis
University of Georgia

Karen Hankins
Clarke County Schools and University of Georgia

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 86
Winter 1997

The work reported herein is a National Reading Research Center Project of the University of Georgia and University of Maryland. It was supported under the Educational Research and Development Centers Program (PR/AWARD NO. 117A20007) as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The findings and opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the National Reading Research Center, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the U.S. Department of Education.

NRRC National Reading Research Center

Executive Committee
Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
University of Georgia
John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
University of Maryland College Park
James F. Baumann, Associate Director
University of Georgia
Patricia S. Koskinen, Associate Director
University of Maryland College Park
Jamie Lynn Metsala, Associate Director
University of Maryland College Park
Penny Oldfather
University of Georgia
John F. O'Flahavan
University of Maryland College Park
James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Cynthia R. Hynd
University of Georgia
Robert Serpell
University of Maryland Baltimore County
Betty Shockley-Bisplinghoff
Clarke County School District, Athens, Georgia
Linda DeGroff
University of Georgia

Publications Editors

Research Reports and Perspectives
Linda DeGroff, Editor
University of Georgia
James V. Hoffman, Associate Editor
University of Texas at Austin
Mariam Jean Dreher, Associate Editor
University of Maryland College Park
Instructional Resources
Lee Galda, *University of Georgia*
Research Highlights
William G. Holliday
University of Maryland College Park
Policy Briefs
James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Videos
Shawn M. Glynn, *University of Georgia*

NRRC Staff
Barbara F. Howard, Office Manager
Kathy B. Davis, Senior Secretary
University of Georgia

Barbara A. Neitzey, Administrative Assistant
Valerie Tyra, Accountant
University of Maryland College Park

National Advisory Board
Phyllis W. Aldrich
Saratoga Warren Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Saratoga Springs, New York
Arthur N. Applebee
State University of New York, Albany
Ronald S. Brandt
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Marshá T. DeLain
Delaware Department of Public Instruction
Carl A. Grant
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Barbara McCombs
Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (MCREL)
Luis C. Moll
University of Arizona
Carol M. Santa
School District No. 5
Kalispell, Montana
Anne P. Sweet
Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education
Louise Cherry Wilkinson
Rutgers University
Peter Winograd
University of Kentucky

Production Editor
Katherine P. Hutchison
University of Georgia

Assistant Production Editor
Jennifer Moon
University of Georgia

Dissemination Coordinator
Jordana E. Rich
University of Georgia

Text Formatter
Angela R. Wilson
University of Georgia

NRRC - University of Georgia
318 Aderhold
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602-7125
(706) 542-3674 Fax: (706) 542-3678
INTERNET: NRRC@uga.cc.uga.edu

NRRC - University of Maryland College Park
3216 J. M. Patterson Building
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742
(301) 405-8035 Fax: (301) 314-9625
INTERNET: NRRC@umail.umd.edu

About the National Reading Research Center

The National Reading Research Center (NRRC) is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education to conduct research on reading and reading instruction. The NRRC is operated by a consortium of the University of Georgia and the University of Maryland College Park in collaboration with researchers at several institutions nationwide.

The NRRC's mission is to discover and document those conditions in homes, schools, and communities that encourage children to become skilled, enthusiastic, lifelong readers. NRRC researchers are committed to advancing the development of instructional programs sensitive to the cognitive, sociocultural, and motivational factors that affect children's success in reading. NRRC researchers from a variety of disciplines conduct studies with teachers and students from widely diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 classrooms. Research projects deal with the influence of family and family-school interactions on the development of literacy; the interaction of sociocultural factors and motivation to read; the impact of literature-based reading programs on reading achievement; the effects of reading strategies instruction on comprehension and critical thinking in literature, science, and history; the influence of innovative group participation structures on motivation and learning; the potential of computer technology to enhance literacy; and the development of methods and standards for alternative literacy assessments.

The NRRC is further committed to the participation of teachers as full partners in its research. A better understanding of how teachers view the development of literacy, how they use knowledge from research, and how they approach change in the classroom is crucial to improving instruction. To further this understanding, the NRRC conducts school-based research in which teachers explore their own philosophical and pedagogical orientations and trace their professional growth.

Dissemination is an important feature of NRRC activities. Information on NRRC research appears in several formats. *Research Reports* communicate the results of original research or synthesize the findings of several lines of inquiry. They are written primarily for researchers studying various areas of reading and reading instruction. The *Perspective Series* presents a wide range of publications, from calls for research and commentary on research and practice to first-person accounts of experiences in schools. *Instructional Resources* include curriculum materials, instructional guides, and materials for professional growth, designed primarily for teachers.

For more information about the NRRC's research projects and other activities, or to have your name added to the mailing list, please contact:

Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
318 Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-7125
(706) 542-3674

John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
3216 J. M. Patterson Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 405-8035

NRRC Editorial Review Board

Peter Afflerbach
University of Maryland College Park

Jane Agee
University of Georgia

JoBeth Allen
University of Georgia

Janice F. Almasi
University of Buffalo–SUNY

Patty Anders
University of Arizona

Harriette Arrington
University of Kentucky

Marlia Banning
University of Utah

Jill Bartoli
Elizabethtown College

Eurydice Bauer
University of Georgia

Janet Benton
Bowling Green, Kentucky

Irene Blum
Pine Springs Elementary School
Falls Church, Virginia

David Bloome
Vanderbilt University

John Borkowski
Notre Dame University

Fenice Boyd
University of Georgia

Karen Bromley
Binghamton University

Martha Carr
University of Georgia

Suzanne Clewell
Montgomery County Public Schools
Rockville, Maryland

Joan Coley
Western Maryland College

Michelle Commeyras
University of Georgia

Linda Cooper
Shaker Heights City Schools
Shaker Heights, Ohio

Karen Costello
Connecticut Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut

Jim Cunningham
Gibsonville, North Carolina

Karin Dahl
Ohio State University

Marcia Delany
Wilkes County Public Schools
Washington, Georgia

Lynne Diaz-Rico
California State University-San Bernardino

Mark Dressman
New Mexico State University

Ann Duffy
University of Georgia

Ann Egan-Robertson
Amherst College

Jim Flood
San Diego State University

Dana Fox
University of Arizona

Linda Gambrell
University of Maryland College Park

Mary Graham
McLean, Virginia

Rachel Grant
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Guzzetti
Arizona State University

Frances Hancock
Concordia College of Saint Paul, Minnesota

Kathleen Heubach
Virginia Commonwealth University

Sally Hudson-Ross
University of Georgia

Cynthia Hynd
University of Georgia

Gay Ivey
University of Georgia

David Jardine
University of Calgary

Robert Jimenez
University of Oregon

Michelle Kelly
University of Utah

James King
University of South Florida

Kate Kirby
Georgia State University

Linda Labbo
University of Georgia

Michael Law
University of Georgia

Donald T. Leu
Syracuse University

Susan Lytle
University of Pennsylvania

Bert Mangino
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Mazzoni
Baltimore, Maryland

Ann Dacey McCann
University of Maryland College Park

Sarah McCarthey
University of Texas at Austin

Veda McClain
University of Georgia

Lisa McFalls
University of Georgia

Randy McGinnis
University of Maryland

Mike McKenna
Georgia Southern University

Barbara Michalove
Fourth Street Elementary School
Athens, Georgia

Elizabeth B. Moje
University of Utah

Lesley Morrow
Rutgers University

Bruce Murray
Auburn University

Susan Neuman
Temple University

John O'Flahavan
University of Maryland College Park

Marilyn Ohlhausen-McKinney
University of Nevada

Penny Oldfather
University of Georgia

Barbara M. Palmer
Mount Saint Mary's College

Stephen Phelps
Buffalo State College

Mike Pickle
Georgia Southern University

Amber T. Prince
Berry College

Gaoyin Qian
Lehman College–CUNY

Tom Reeves
University of Georgia

Lenore Ringler
New York University

Mary Roe
University of Delaware

Nadeen T. Ruiz
California State University-
Sacramento

Olivia Saracho
University of Maryland College Park

Paula Schwanenflugel
University of Georgia

Robert Serpell
University of Maryland Baltimore
County

Betty Shockley-Bisplinghoff
Barnett Shoals Elementary School
Athens, Georgia

Wayne H. Slater
University of Maryland College Park

Margaret Smith
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Sonnenschein
University of Maryland Baltimore
County

Bernard Spodek
University of Illinois

Bettie St. Pierre
University of Georgia

Steve Stahl
University of Georgia

Roger Stewart
Boise State University

Anne P. Sweet
Office of Educational Research
and Improvement

Louise Tomlinson
University of Georgia

Bruce VanSledright
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Walker
Eastern Montana University–Billings

Louise Waynant
Prince George's County Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Dera Weaver
Athens Academy
Athens, Georgia

Jane West
Agnes Scott College

Renee Weisburg
Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

Allan Wigfield
University of Maryland College Park

Shelley Wong
University of Maryland College Park

Josephine Peyton Young
University of Georgia

Hallie Yopp
California State University

About the Authors

Michelle Commeyras teaches at the University of Georgia and is a researcher with the National Reading Research Center. She has a B.A. in History and an M.A. in Critical and Creative Thinking, both from the University of Massachusetts/Boston. She received a Ph.D. in Education from the University of Illinois/Champaign-Urbana. She is interested in pedagogy that challenges students to think analytically and critically during text-based classroom discussions.

Linda DeGroff is an Associate Professor in the Department of Language Education at the University of Georgia where she teaches classes in children's literature and language arts methods. Prior to doing graduate work at Syracuse University, she taught first grade for 12 years. Her recent research has involved surveying and interviewing diverse literacy professionals about their work and ways of knowing.

Randi Nevins Stanulis received a doctorate in Curriculum and Teaching with an emphasis in Language Arts from Michigan State University. She has taught integrated language arts at Spartan Village Professional Development School in East Lansing, Michigan, and at Hong Kong International School in Hong Kong. She is currently an Assistant Professor of Elementary Education at the University of Georgia. She is also a memeber of the National Reading Research Center.

Karen Hankins is a primary grade teacher at Whit Davis Elementary in Athens, Ga., and a doctoral student in language education at the University of Georgia. She has tuaght undergraduate classes at UGA and graduate classes as adjunct faculty at Brenau College. Her research interests are the social and political issues surrounding children and literature. She writes about the hermeneutic connections between herself and the children she teaches. Recently, she celebrated her first solo publication in *Teacher Research Journal*.

National Reading Research Center
Universities of Georgia and Maryland
Reading Research Report No. 86
Winter 1997

Literacy Professionals' Ways of Knowing: A National Survey

Michelle Commeyras
Linda DeGroff
Randi Stanulis
University of Georgia

Karen Hankins
Clarke County Schools and University of Georgia

Abstract. *The purpose of this study was to assess how literacy professionals acquire knowledge as well as what knowledge they possess and value. The questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of K–12 teachers, reading specialists, administrators, library-media specialists, and teacher educators in the United States. Results are based on 1,519 responses. The report discusses findings in terms of knowing through professional development (reading professional literature, teacher education, and teacher research) and knowing about three current pedagogical topics (book clubs, portfiolio assessment, and motivation). Results indicate that literacy professionals: (a) read practitioner journal articles, books, and professional newspapers more often than research journals or electronic sources; (b) believe that collaborative experiences between mentor teachers, student teachers, and teacher educators are important, but many of them have had little experience with such collaborations; (c) are familiar with teacher research, are interested in becoming teacher researchers, and find their practices influenced by teacher research; (d) agree that book clubs are a valuable form of pedagogy, but most have not had such experiences themselves and fewer still have had experiences with book clubs in which multicultural literature was read; (e) have knowledge, experience, and interest in portfolio assessment, but do not agree that portfolios should replace other forms of assessment; (f) find intrinsic indicators of motivation to be more meaningful than extrinsic indicators.*

Introduction

In a nation that values literacy and where there continues to be concerns about illiteracy (Kozol, 1985; Johnston, 1996) and aliteracy (Thimmesch, 1984), it is important to continue learning about how literacy professionals construct knowledge of teaching and learning. By literacy professionals we mean K–12 teachers, reading specialists, teacher educators in reading, language arts, and related fields, library media specialists, and school adminis-

trators who make policy decisions related to literacy education. Concerns about literacy education invariably lead to questions about the extent to which public education is succeeding in teaching every child to read and to value reading. The public holds teachers, administrators, and policy makers accountable for providing all children with educations that produce literate citizens. Although there is cause for debate with regard to whether the educational system is solely responsible for illiteracy and aliteracy, there is no doubt that the public expects the nation's teachers to teach every child to read, to enjoy reading, and to use reading to make informed decisions as citizens in a democratic society. We find that the concerns and issues that revolve around reading education eventually lead to a question such as: How do teachers acquire knowledge that determines the way they teach reading? For this reason, we believe it is important to continue learning about how literacy professionals construct knowledge of teaching and learning.

Learning more about how literacy professionals gain knowledge that affects their teaching practices is needed in order to support professional growth and development that leads to practices and policies that help children become literate. Furthermore, the importance of attending to how professional knowledge is created is reflected in the increase in research on teacher knowledge, much of which has been synthesized in reviews of the literature by Carter (1990) and Fenstermacher (1994).

The literature on teacher knowledge can be characterized in two ways. First, there are studies that typically employ qualitative methods in order to understand how individuals or small groups of professionals in localized contexts construct knowledge (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Elbaz, 1983; Shulman, 1987). Most of these studies have examined classroom teachers' general knowledge, and a subset of studies (e.g., Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Hollingsworth, 1994) have examined knowledge within the specific domain of literacy. Second, there are studies of national populations of educators. These have typically employed survey research (National Education Association, 1988; Smylie, 1989). As with the studies of small samples, these surveys have focused on knowledge of general education rather than specific ways of knowing (e.g., knowledge gained from reading professional materials, knowledge gained from conducting teacher research, knowledge gained from using portfolio assessment) within the domain of literacy.

The lack of a national survey on literacy professionals' ways of knowing is not a result of survey research being devalued in the field of reading research. To the contrary, survey research has long played an important role in reading research (Venezky, 1984), from Rice's (1893) study of spelling to Austin and Morrison's (1963) *The First R* to a recent national survey of children's attitudes toward reading (McKenna, Kear, & Ellsworth, 1995). Survey research has also been used to study educators' reactions to changes in the National Assessment of Educational Progress in Reading (Commeyras, Osborn, & Bruce, 1992; 1994) and elementary school teachers' use of and opinion of basal reading programs (Baumann & Heubach, 1994).

The research reported here was inspired, in part, by the realization that it was timely to conduct a national survey to ascertain what factors literacy professionals think lead to changes in knowledge, beliefs, and practices. It was also viewed as a unique way to extend the work of a group of researchers within the National Reading Research Center who had conducted qualitative studies on literacy professionals' ways of knowing. The substance of the survey questionnaire was grounded in a strand of research studies conducted over a three-year period that addressed questions such as:

1) What can be learned from seeking students' perspectives on their motivation for literacy learning? (Oldfather, 1993, 1994; Oldfather & Dahl, 1994; Thomas & Oldfather, 1996)

2) How do teacher candidates and mentor teachers acquire and develop knowledge about literacy within a collaborative, school-based teacher education program? (Hudson-Ross & Graham, 1996)

3) How does professional knowledge develop when teachers participate in a teacher-researcher community? (Baumann, Allen, & Shockley, 1994; Baumann, Shockley, & Allen, 1996)

4) How are library media specialists' roles in reading instruction perceived? (DeGroff, 1996)

5) What might teachers learn about other cultures, about literacy development and instruction, and about themselves from participating in book clubs? (Flood, Lapp, Alvarez, Romero, Ranck-Buhr, Moore, Kabildis, & Lungren, 1994)

6) How do teachers come to know about themselves, their practice, and their students by examining student literacy portfolios? (Kieffer & Faust, 1994; Kieffer & Morrison, 1994)

7) How can literacy be promoted through home-school cooperation? (Baker, Sonnenschein, Serpell, Fernandez-Fein, & Sher, 1994; Serpell, Baker, & Sonnenschein, 1995; Sonnenschein, Baker, & Serpell, 1995; Sonnenschein, Baker, Serpell, Scher, Fernandez-Fein, & Munstermann, 1996)

8) How can teachers explore gender issues that are counterproductive to students' engagement in classroom talk about texts? (Alvermann, 1996; Alvermann, Commeyras, Young, Randall, & Hinson, 1996)

The researchers involved in these studies worked with us on this project as affiliated researchers. They helped construct questionnaire items that represented aspects of their prior and ongoing research that they deemed important to investigate with a national sample of literacy professionals.

Although we wanted to gather data that reflected the individual studies contributing to the survey study, we also wanted to attend to the "ways of knowing" thread as it might cut across studies. In order to do this, we looked for ways in which that thread manifested itself in the studies and determined there were two general question stems to guide us—knowing about and knowing through. The questions for each of the individual studies asked how or what literacy professionals know *about* a literacy topic and/or *through* which experiences they learned. In sum, the survey questions would ask literacy professionals how or what

they know about student motivation, teacher research, library media specialist roles, book clubs, portfolio assessment, home and school connections, and gender issues. And the survey would ask how they know through reading professional literature, teacher education, teacher research, book clubs, and portfolio assessment.

Asking people how they "know about" or "know through" a literacy topic might work well with an open-ended questionnaire or in interviews where one can begin with general questions and probe for specifics. But such a line of questioning would be too broad to be useful in a forced-choice questionnaire. We came to realize that in order to tap into literacy professionals' ways of knowing about or through, we would need to ask specific questions about their interests, experiences, influences, and beliefs.

Questions were created to gather information on how interested literacy professionals were in topics studied by the NRRC researchers. There is a relationship between what learners' find interesting and what they understand and ultimately know (Alexander, Jetton, & Kulikowich, 1995; Renninger, Hidi, & Krapp, 1992). Interest is synonymous with intrinsic motivation (Deci, 1992). People pursue knowledge related to what interests them. Tobias (1994) in a review of research on interest, prior knowledge, and learning states that "it is almost a truism that people know more about topics related to their interests than they do about others" (p. 38). When interest is present then a conscious effort to think and learn is more likely to occur. An expression of interest about some area of educational theory or practice is a good indication that some knowledge may be present and that more knowledge may be sought. Questionnaire items were used to gather information on the degree of interest literacy professionals' had in: conducting teacher research, using or participating in book clubs, using portfolio assessment, and teaching that focuses on gender in discussions of text.

Questions were created to gather information on the kinds of experiences teachers were having that paralleled what was studied by NRRC researchers. A commonly held perception is that the more experience one has in classrooms the more one knows about teaching. While some have taken a critical look at the presumption that experience is the real ground of knowledge (Britzman, 1991; Johnston, 1994; Scott, 1992) there continues in the minds of many the view that experience is the best teacher. The term *experienced teacher* implies one who is accomplished because she or he has learned from many and varied experiences. Harrington in an examination of teaching and knowing offers that "knowledge is constructed, built on previous knowledge, coupled with experience, transformable, evolving, and consequential" (p. 191). There seems little doubt that experiential learning plays an important role in the process of knowing about how to teach. For this reason, questionnaire items were used to collect information on literacy professionals' experience with collaborative teacher education, teacher research, book clubs, portfolio assessment, and with reading professional literature.

Questions about how influential certain experiences were on literacy professionals'

thinking and practice were created to gather information on their ways of knowing. As Dewey points out, "When we experience something we act upon it, we do something with it; then we suffer or undergo the consequences. We do something to the thing and then it does something to us in return..." (p. 139). Inquiring into the degree to which something has been influential is one way to understand the significance of teaching and learning experiences. Questions about influence also reveal the variety of ways that teachers gain knowledge. Questionnaire items sought information about the influence of reading different kinds of professional literature. They also focused on different ways of learning about and through teacher research and portfolio assessment.

Questions were created to gather information about literacy professionals' beliefs about aspects of the NRRC research studies previously mentioned. Beliefs have been and continue to be an important site of research for those who study teacher knowledge, teacher education, and teaching practices. Pajares (1992), in a review of teachers' beliefs and educational research, cites a number of sources to support his claim that "few would argue that the beliefs teachers hold influence their perceptions and judgments, which, in turn, affect their behavior in the classroom, or that understanding the belief structures of teachers and teacher candidates is essential to improving their professional preparation and teaching practices" (p. 307). Some believe that studying teacher beliefs is the most valuable psychological construct in teacher education (Pintrich, 1990). One way of investigating belief is to ask individuals to assess the truth or falsity of propositions. (Pajares, 1992). Our approach was to ask respondents the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with statements about: (a) indicators of a student's motivation for literacy, (b) roles that might be assumed by library media specialists, (c) uses of portfolio assessment, and (d) home and school responsibilities in helping children become literate.

Methods

Questionnaire Development

Creating the survey questionniare was a multi-stage process. It involved working with the affiliated researchers, a consultant with expertise in survey research,[1] and two literacy teacher educator consultants.[2] In the first stage we asked the affiliated researchers to provide us with ideas for questions based on their prior and in-progress studies of literacy professionals' ways of knowing. They provided questions that were either open-ended or had forced-choice options. Simultaneously, we developed demographic questionnaire items and items on knowledge gained from reading the professional literature.

---

[1]We wish to thank Dr. Diane Samdahl for sharing her expertise on survey design.

[2]We thank Dr. Patricia Anders at the University of Arizona and Dr. Donal J. Leu at Syracuse University for piloting the questionnaire with their students and generously providing substantial feedback about the survey design.

In the second stage we worked with the affiliated researchers' ideas for questionnaire items in order to develop sets of forced-choice items for each research study. We then consulted with an expert on survey research on the item sets we had created. The consultant helped us refine the focus and wording of both questions and response options according to established principles of survey research. Drafts of questionnaire items were then returned to the affiliated researchers for their consideration and approval.

The third stage of development was to create a pilot version of the questionnaire. Based on the feedback from our affiliated researchers we created a 97-item questionnaire. Copies of the questionnaire were distributed to our two teacher educator consultants who had agreed to pilot the questionnaire with K–12 literacy teachers taking courses at their universities. The consultants provided us with a critique of the questionnaire and recommended changes based on the pilot results and their expert knowledge of literacy. In addition, we piloted the questionnaire with 21 pre-service teachers, 4 library media specialists, 3 principals, and 9 teachers at schools in Georgia. Pilot participants answered the questionnaire items and offered comments about the clarity of the items and appropriateness of the response options.

The fourth and final stage of development involved revising questionnaire items based on pilot information and consultants recommendations. Changes included dropping some items, rewording questions, offering new response options such as "not applicable" to some items, and creating new items to gather information on respondents' views of reading and their religious affiliation. A final version of the survey questionnaire (see Appendix) was printed with 99 items presented in the following order:

- 9 items on knowing from reading the professional literature,
- 10 items on intrinsic and extrinsic indicators of student motivation for literacy learning,
- 6 items on the importance of student teaching and mentoring in becoming a literacy professional,
- 8 items on interest and impact of teacher research on beliefs and practices,
- 14 items on library media specialists' roles as literacy professionals,
- 14 items on adult and student book clubs and multicultural literature,
- 13 items on beliefs and practices associated with portfolio assessment,
- 7 items on beliefs about literacy and the responsibility of home and school in fostering literacy,
- 9 items on beliefs and practices with regard to gender issues in literacy education,
- 2 items on beliefs about truth,
- 1 item on approaches to teaching reading and writing, and
- 6 demographic items

Questionnaire Distribution

The design of the study called for using a national mail probability sample and a four-wave mailing procedure patterned after Dillman's (1983) Total Design Method. The first

wave consisted of an advance letter to 5,100 potential respondents informing them of the study and its purposes and requesting their participation in subsequent mailings. The second wave was the mailing of the survey questionnaire. The third wave was a post card reminder. The fourth wave was a second mailing of the questionnaire to those literacy professionals who had not yet responded.

The sampling procedures were designed to ensure that all literacy professionals throughout the United States had a near equal chance of being selected for inclusion in the sample. The sample was drawn by Market Data Retrieval, Inc. of Shelton, CT., a company specializing in education-related marketing services. Random samples were drawn of the MDR databases for school principals, library media specialists, reading specialists, middle and high school English teachers, K-6 elementary school teachers, and teacher educators in reading/language arts (see Table 1). Providing for equal selection opportunity is a necessary requirement if probability sample is to be obtained. Bias in response is also minimized, and inferences about the national population of literacy professionals can be made from the results obtained in the survey.

Data Analysis

Simple descriptive statistics were calculated for the 97 forced-choice questionnaire items. Frequencies and percentages were computed for all respondents and for the following subcategories of literacy professionals: Teacher K-2; Teacher 3-5; Teacher 6-8; Teacher 9-12; Administrator, Reading Specialist, Library-Media Specialist, and Teacher Educator. Correlations across all questionnaire items were also computed. The two open-ended items that asked respondents to describe their (a) racial/ethnic identity and (b) their religious orientation were coded and placed into categories.

At the end of the questionnaire there was an invitation to write comments about the study. The comments written there and on other pages of the questionnaire were collected in a word-processing file and imported into a computer program useful for coding textual or narrative data (Seidel, 1988). Respondents' comments were coded for topic and/or location. For example, if a respondent wrote a comment about portfolio assessment that response was coded "portfolios." If a respondent wrote a comment in response to a particular questionnaire item on portfolios then the comment was double coded by the item number (e.g., Q#63) and as "portfolios."

Results

Respondents

A total of 5,100 questionnaires were mailed to literacy professionals and 1,519 were returned. According to Kalton (1983), response rates in mail surveys vary widely with rates of over 20% generally considered valid for making generalizations about the sampled population. The response rate of 29% in this study is well above the acceptable range.

Literacy professionals responded to nine demographic questions that are useful in profiling who participated in the survey. The majori-

ty of the respondents identified themselves as female (86%), White/Caucasian/European American (87%), and they support an eclectic approach to literacy instruction that combines basic skills with whole language (82%).

There were more responses from elementary school teachers (34%) than from middle school (15%) or high school (8%) teachers. Responses were also received from library media specialists (14%), teacher educators (14%), reading specialists (7%), and administrators (7%). See Table 1 for frequency of responses for each category of literacy professional.

The respondents varied significantly with regard to the number of years they had been employed in education. Respondents had from 1 to 51 years of experience with a median of 20 years of employment in education. Almost half (47%) of the respondents indicated having earned a master's degree. The other half were divided between those with a bachelor degree (28%) and those with either a specialist or doctoral degree (23%). See Table 2 for report of highest degrees earned by respondents.

The analysis of how respondents chose to describe their religious orientation revealed that most respondents could be classified as either Protestant (36%), Christain (19%), or Catholic (23%). There were few respondents who identified themselves as Jewish (2%) or as belonging to non-traditional Christian religions (1%), or Eastern Religions (1%). Of interest is the wide range of responses that were too individualistic to be categorized (9%). We sought information on religious beliefs because we recognized religion as an important belief system that may affect how individual literacy professionals think about knowledge.

We also sought to understand how they viewed "truth" with two questions taken from Schommer's (1994) epistemological inventory (see Table 2). A majority of respondents (60%) agreed that "researchers can ultimately get to the truth," while fewer respondents (37%) agreed that "truth is unchanging." There are quite a few respondents who have faith in research leading to truth while maintaining the view that truth changes.

Knowing Through Reading Professional Literature

The professional literature on teaching reading and writing for educators is rich and continues to grow each year. The production of this body of literature is based on the assumption that new ideas derived from research and practical experience can be disseminated to practitioners through print and other media. Kirsch and Guthrie (1984) found that the majority of adults across professions tend to read to solve immediate problems and spend little time reading to acquire general knowledge within their professions. According to a National Education Association (NEA, 1988) survey, only 20% of teachers rated professional journals as "definitely effective" as a source of teaching knowledge and skills. Alvermann (1990), in writing about reading teacher education, noted that we need to know more about who uses what sources and how they incorporate what they learn into their practices. For example, those of us who publish results of research must ask, do research reports get read, and if so, do they contain the kind of information that changes educators' thinking

and practice? We investigated questions such as this by asking literacy professionals how often they read specific types of professional literature (see Table 3) and whether reading those resources influenced their beliefs or resulted in significant changes with regard to their teaching practices.

Results

A summary of results for six items on reading the professional literature in Table 3 provides details regarding which literacy professionals read which kinds of professional literature six or more times a year. Journals that publish articles that focus on the practical implications of research findings and provide experientially derived teaching ideas are read by high school teachers, administrators, reading specialists, library media specialists, and teacher educators more often than any other type of literature. Whereas, the most often read resource for elementary and middle school teachers are magazines such as *Instructor*, *Mailbox*, and *Teaching K-8*. The finding that twice as many elementary school teachers reported reading magazines (73%) than academic practitioner journals (33%) lends to two interpretations. First, it seems expedient in terms of both cost and time for elementary school teachers who teach math, science, social studies and other areas in addition to reading and language arts to prefer magazines written for generalists. Second, teachers' interests in these magazines reminds us that they are interested in practice; they want to know what to do in their classrooms. The magazines emphasize practices and activities instead of theory and research. While this need by teachers may not appeal to those whose work focuses on theory and research, it reflects the reality of teachers' day-to-day lives in the classroom.

With regard to reading the research journals the data again confirm what is generally presumed to be true. It was the teacher educators who are most likely to be reading journals such as *Reading Research Quarterly* and *Research in the Teaching of English* on a regular basis. While the vast majority of teacher educators seem to have some interest in reading research they are still more likely to be found reading practitioner journal articles (87%), books (80%), or newspapers (65%) published by professional organizations six or more times a year. Only 7% of teacher educators reported never reading research journals; whereas, the percentages for other literacy professionals who never read them ranged from a high of 60% (elementary school teachers) to a low of 36% (administrators and reading specialists). One elementary school teacher with 30 years of experience felt it important to tell us why she does not value reading research journals. She wrote:

> I think my teaching success has come from loving children and teaching. Research has nothing to do with this. Experiences that work that I hear from others are what count. I have never found much research worth reading. (Selected "never" for research journals but said she reads books about literacy teaching or learning "11 or more times" a year.)

Nonetheless, there are teachers who occasionally read research journals anywhere from once to five times in the past year. This was the case for 40% of high school teachers, 38%

of middle school teachers, 31% of elementary school teachers, and 42% of reading specialists.

The data on electronic sources of information shows that slightly more than half the respondents (54%) read them anywhere from 1 to more than 11 times in a year. Library media specialists report reading electronic sources more often than other literacy professionals. Almost half of the library media specialists (42%) report reading electronic texts eleven or more times a year. This is in sharp contrast to the 61% of elementary school teachers who report never reading electronic texts. There were also significant numbers of middle school (52%) and high school (43%) teachers who do not read electronic sources of information.

Knowing About Student Motivation

The questionnaire items on motivation are based on a longitudinal qualitative study of what students say contributes to their motivation to engage in reading and writing school experiences. The study began in a whole-language classroom of 31 fifth- and sixth-grade students in southern California (Oldfather, 1991) and continued by addressing students' perceptions of what did or did not contribute to their feeling motivated to engage in literacy activities at school (Oldfather, 1993, 1994). A subset of those students have participated in researching their motivation for literacy learning in middle school (Oldfather & McLaughlin, 1993) and in high school. Reports of findings focus primarily on identifying classroom conditions and teaching styles that students said led them to become "personally invested in their literacy activities" (Oldfather, 1993, p. 1). Thus, the emphasis was to understand intrinsic motivation as opposed to extrinsic motivation. Two major conclusions were that intrinsic motivation depends on "a deep responsiveness to students' self-expression—to their ideas, opinions, feelings, needs, interests, hopes, and dreams—and an emphasis on the students' construction of meaning" (Oldfather, 1993, p. 3). Analyses and interpretation explore self-expression, personal meaningfuless, choice, and responsive teaching.

For the national survey project, Oldfather, the principal investigator of the longitudinal research, decided that it was important to seek information about literacy professionals' ways of knowing about student motivation. Students in her research reported that certain classroom conditions and orientations toward teaching fostered an intrinsic motivation to read and write beyond class requirements. Students also said that the introduction of letter grade report cards in middle school led them to feel more extrinsically motivated than intrinsically motivated. They had been accustomed to the narrative report cards used at their elementary school. A list of eight indicators of student motivation were used in items to gather data on what literacy professionals across the nation use to know about motivation for literacy learning (see Table 4).

Results

Across the various subgroups of literacy professionals there is a high degree of consistency in how they rated the indicators of motivation. The vast majority of literacy profes-

sionals found all the indicators to be meaningful to some degree. Less than 1% of respondents indicated that one of the indicators was "not meaningful." The most telling findings come from comparing the percentage of respondents who rated each indicator as "most meaningful" (see Table 4). These data yield a ranking of indicators from most important to least important to educators.

Meaningful indicators of motivation. The indicator of motivation that was most meaningful was "chooses to read/write on their own beyond class requirements." Seventy percent of respondents said this was a very meaningful indicator of a student's motivation for literacy learning. Of all the indicators provided this one best exemplifies intrinsic motivation. It is significant that an indicator of intrinsic motivation is viewed as most meaningful given that most report cards of student progress are not designed to capture the extent to which a student is choosing to engage in reading and writing that is not specifically required to complete a teacher's requirements. In sharp contrast is the indicator of motivation that received the lowest endorsement by educators. Less than one-fourth of all respondents (22%) found achieving "high test scores and good grades" a very meaningful indicator of motivation. Of all the indicators this one is most obviously representative of extrinsic motivation. When students engage in reading and writing because they want to get high scores on tests that in turn will earn them good grades they are less likely to be pursuing their own personal literacy needs.

It is of further interest that there are some significant differences among the literacy professionals about the meaningfulness of tests and grades as indicators of motivation. The library media specialists (31%) found tests and grades more important than any other group of literacy professionals. Teacher educators (16%) and teachers of kindergarten through grade two (17%) were likely to know about motivation through grades and test performance. One teacher educator with 27 years of experience in education wrote "at the college level I have met too many students with high grades and no genuine love of learning." She rated tests and grades as somewhat meaningful indicators of motivation for literacy learning. Teachers in grades 3 to 12 (22% to 26%) gave slightly more credence to tests and grades as very meaningful than did administrators (19%) and reading specialists (20%). Further investigations of educators' thinking about the relationship among motivation, literacy learning, tests, and grades would be helpful in understanding these differences.

Other indicators of motivation. The remaining six indicators of motivation represent some middle ground with regard to what is very meaningful to educators. Within this middle ground there are some important differences. It is interesting to speculate on the reasons why more than half (54%) of respondents find "applies principles of critical thinking to literate activity," a very meaningful indicator of motivation. One possibility is that critical thinking is effortful because it requires one to delve beyond literal or obvious understandings of text. When students exhibit the will and skill to do such they are going beyond the basic requirements set out for an assignment. Such students must be highly engaged with the task

at hand if they seek to clarify ambiguities, judge the acceptability of inferences, and analyze the validity and veracity of statements. This explanation leads to viewing applying principles of critical thinking to literate activities as representative of intrinsic motivation. Thus, we again see educators favoring indicators of intrinsic motivation.

Almost half (48%) of the respondents thought that it was very meaningful when students initiate reflective self-assessment. The move toward alternative ways of assessing student literacy learning has introduced the idea that students should be involved in evaluating their understandings, their products, and their progress (Valencia, Hiebert, & Afflerbach, 1994). It is possible that the influence of that movement in education is responsible for the strong endorsement of student self-assessment. Because this indicator is clearly about something that a student initiates, it also represents intrinsic motivation.

There were four other indicators that approximately one-third of respondents found very meaningful. Two of the indicators represent intrinsic motivation, one is more aligned with extrinsic motivation, and the fourth is difficult to classify as intrinsic or extrinsic. The indicators of intrinsic motivation are "initiates or suggests ideas for class projects" and "challenges an author's authority." In both cases the student is acting from his or her own thinking processes and volunteering an idea or judgment. The fact that only 33% of respondents find offering ideas for class projects as very meaningful could be because project ideas appear loosely connected to engaging in literacy. It is probably true that educators' conceptions of what belongs under the umbrella term of literacy learning varies considerably. Certainly definitions of literacy differ in the literature (Brown, 1991; Kamil, 1995).

Only 31% of all respondents rated "challenges an author's authority" as very meaningful. There were more teacher educators (44%) who thought so than any other group of literacy professionals. The idea that challenging an author's authority might be a very meaningful indicator of literacy learning may depend on the degree to which educators see that as part of critical thinking. One teacher educator with 27 years experience wrote that this indicator "depends on openness to self correction; justice done to the author's meaning, ie, genuine effort to understand before, challenging what's there."

Another possibility is that respondents who find challenging an author's authority to be meaningful do so because they value critical literacy. Interest in critical literacy and critical pedagogy has become more evident in recent years. As explained by Shannon in a 1991 article in *The Reading Teacher*, "critical literacy ... asks you to consider the politics of the authors you read and to decide whose side you are on when you write" (Jongsma, 1991, p. 518). Those educators whose definition of being literate includes analyzing how texts represent and reproduce social structures and inequities would find it meaningful to see students bring up issues that challenge both the authority of authors and texts.

When a student participates regularly in class assignments and activities that is considered a very meaningful indicator of motivation for 36% of respondents. It is difficult to classi-

fy this indicator as representative of either intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. Extrinsic reasons such as pleasing the teacher or getting good grades may lead a student to participate regularly or the student may find the school work intrinsically interesting and important. Furthermore, it is possible that students are simultaneously extrinsically and intrinsically motivated to participate regularly in assignments and activites.

Meeting a teacher's standards for high-quality work was viewed as very meaningful by 31% of respondents. This indicator of motivation focuses on something external to the student's own sense of what matters; therefore, it reflects more on extrinsic factors than intrinsic ones. In school and in the workplace there is an expectation that students and employees will do work that meets the standards set by their superiors. The use of the word meeting in this indicator of motivation suggests that the student is focused on doing what someone else has determined to be important.

Concluding remarks. The literacy professionals' responses reveal greater value for intrinsic indicators of motivation than for extrinsic indicators of motivation. This finding is important in light of the research on student motivation conducted by Oldfather (1991, 1993, 1994). The elements of intrinsic motivation that were identified through listening to students' perceptions of their own motivation are seen as very meaningful to many literacy educators. The kind of motivation that students and teachers value is not something teachers do to students, rather it "flows out of children's natural curiosities and social inclinations as well as their yearnings for self-determination" (Thomas & Oldfather, 1996, p. 3). Indeed, one reading specialist with 17 years experience wrote next to the motivation items, "I teach remedial reading, I focus more on reading than writing. I believe interest and choice are the most important factors in motivating my reluctant readers." This respondent viewed all indicators but one (initiates reflective self-assessment) as somewhat meaningful or not meaningful.

Another comment reminds us that there may be other very important indicators of motivation to consider. An elementary school teacher with 30 years of experience wrote that "some children just cannot do some of these things, but they still want to do their best." She added to the survey the following indicator of motivation: "work to the best of their capability." Knowing what are considered as meaningful indicators of student motivation is an important one because of the widespread concern by teachers in the U.S. over students' apparent lack of motivation toward reading and writing (O'Flahavan, 1992).

Knowing Through Teacher Education

A two-year qualitative study was conducted on a newly designed teacher education program for the preparation of secondary school English teachers (Graham & Hudson-Ross, 1996; Hudson-Ross & Graham, 1996). The purpose of the study was to "examine how mentor teachers' and preservice teacher-candidates' knowledge about literacy teaching is acquired and develops over time within a collaborative, school-based teacher development program" (Hudson-Ross & Graham, 1996, p. 1). A

central principle of the teacher education program is that the mentor secondary school English teachers, the preservice teacher candidates, and the university faculty should work collaboratively as an ongoing community of learners wherein everyone might learn how to be better teachers of English. In practice this meant that everyone would assume roles and responsibilites that differ from what had been the norm in the former secondary school English teacher education program at the University of Georgia. The two university faculty members spent a great deal of time in area high schools with the mentor teachers and teacher candidates (e.g., worked in schools throughout preplanning week). Communication among the triad of mentor teacher, teacher candidate, and university supervisor was further facilitated through the use of a three-way dialogue journal. The teacher candidates spent time in mentor teachers' classrooms throughout the school year. This eventually led to collaborative planning between a mentor teacher and his or her teacher candidate for the spring student teaching experience. Collaboration was also fostered through teacher research projects where the teacher candidate served as research aide to his or her mentor teacher. In sum, many avenues were used to create a three-way collaboration that fostered shared power, regular communication, and developed a sense of community for all involved in the teacher education program.

The university researchers' analyses of the data collected on the program have been reported according to three major categories of growth with regard to what mattered for everyone in learning to be better teachers. They are: (a) examining one's definition of English teaching; (b) developing understandings of the mentoring role; and (c) realizing the impact of a collaborative inquiry-oriented community on individuals' thinking and practice (Hudson-Ross & Graham, 1996). Embedded within and across these categories is the conclusion that mentor teachers learned side by side with teacher candidates and university faculty about changes they wanted to make in their practices as teachers of English. It is clear that the new roles available to mentor teachers through collaborating on the preparation of new English teachers was largely responsible for their sense of professional growth and renewal.

To further situate the significance of the collaborative teacher education program the two university researchers who designed it helped write survey questionnaire items on knowing through collaborative teacher education experiences. Six questionnaire items were introduced to respondents with the following explanation:

> Student teaching is an important experience in becoming a literacy professional. During student teaching, the student teacher, the classroom teacher, and the university supervisor are each involved to some extent in the student teaching experience. The following questions ask you to assess to what degree you value a three-way collaboration during student teaching. A collaboration would include activities such as the student teacher, classroom teacher, and university supervisor meeting together to plan the student teaching experience, sharing agendas for the experience, or working together to determine what kinds of feedback on teaching and learning would be most helpful.

Results

Experience with three-way collaboration. Respondents were asked to indicate how often they have been involved in a three-way collaboration that involved a student teacher, classroom teacher, and university supervisor. The response options were "never," "seldom," and "frequently" (see Table 5). Only among teacher educators is there a majority of persons who have "frequently" (65%) been involved in three-way collaborations. Seventy percent of the other literacy professionals said they have "never" or "seldom" been involved. One library media specialist with fourteen years experience responded "never" and wrote that her only involvement was when she was a student teacher. While an elementary school teacher with ten years of experience responded "frequently" and wrote "when I was student teaching not since." It is possible that other respondents who said they "frequently" or "seldom" were involved in three-way collaboration only during their own student teaching experience.

While approximately 65% of teacher educators report frequently being involved in three-way collaborations there is little reason to assume that what they have experienced is the kind of collaboration that Hudson-Ross and Graham (1996) describe in their English teacher education program. Obviously the concept of collaboration can be interpreted in vastly different ways. While the introduction to the items does imply that the student teacher, mentor teacher, and university supervisor collaborate on all facets of the student teaching experience it is possible that respondents who had seldomly or even frequently been involved in three-way collaborations had in mind collaborative experiences where there is less parity among participants.

Belief in the importance of three-way collaboration. While all literacy professionals may not have the opportunity or even an interest in participating in three-way teacher education collaborations they can still hold opinions about the value of them. Although such collaborations may seem obviously desirable, it seemed important to ask respondents to what degree they believed in the kind of collaboration described in the introductory remarks. The vast majority (89%) of literacy professionals indicated that such collaborations were important or very important (see Table 5). One high school teacher with sixteen years of experience selected "somewhat important" and wrote "I do not approve of the current common practices for training teachers." The strongest endorsement came from three-quarters of the teacher educators who said it was very important. Also significant to the research by Hudson-Ross and Graham is that only 37% of high school teachers rated three-way collaborations as very important. The high school teachers who served as mentors in the new collaborative approach to teacher preparation were according to Hudson-Ross and Graham (1996) initially "distrustful of university faculty, unsure of what the agenda might be, and expecting to be 'used' in ways to which they were accustomed" (p. 4). High school teachers' initial skepticism dissolved over the course of the yearlong three-way collaboration. One mentor teacher is quoted as saying that "other teachers are constantly asking questions about [the

program]. I thoroughly enjoy telling people and having them say, 'Why hasn't anyone thought of that before now?'" (Hudson-Ross & Graham, 1996, p. 23). Thus, although it may be seem intuitively important to many literacy professionals that three-way collaborations are important, it may be that participating in successful teacher education collaborations needs to occur before a majority of potential mentor teachers will say it is very important. And as one teacher educator noted, who selected "somewhat important," collaboration "depends on quality and knowledge of the 3 participants."

Influence on practice. Hudson-Ross and Graham investigated the ways in which three-way collaboration experiences affected the high school mentor teachers. Many of the mentor teachers reported that their teaching practices were influenced by the new roles and responsibilities they assumed in working with teacher candidates and with Hudson-Ross and Graham. Three survey questions were posed to determine if literacy professionals across the United States thought their practices had been influenced by experiences that could occur in three-way collaborations (see Table 6).

Blurring the traditional lines that divide college coursework from practicum experiences in high school classrooms was an important element of the English teacher education program Hudson-Ross and Graham (1996) studied. This occurred when one of the mentor teachers taught university courses for one year while a teacher educator took over her high school teaching responsibilites (Hudson-Ross & McWhorter, 1996). To investigate the possibility that similar means of blurring the lines occur, survey respondents were asked if their practice had been influenced by being a teacher, co-teacher, or guest speaker in university courses. About one-third (36%) of K-12 teachers, reading specialists, and library media specialists responded that they agreed or strongly agreed that such experiences influenced their practice. Whereas, almost half (48%) of K-12 teachers, reading specialists, and library media specialists said this kind of experience did not apply to them. A significant proportion of administrators (62%) agreed or strongly agreed that they had been influenced by teaching, co-teaching, and guest lecturing university courses on teacher education. Apparently school principals are much more likely to be participating in teaching experiences in college and university settings than are teachers, reading specialists, and library media-specialists. Furthermore, these administrators find that such opportunities influence their administrative practices. What remains unknown is exactly how practices have been influenced.

Hudson-Ross and Graham (1996) report that the high school English teachers in their study acquired new understandings of what they could gain from serving as mentors to teacher candidates. They give examples of yearlong relationships between high school teachers and teacher candidates that produced partnerships based on equal-status interactions that were mutually beneficial to both persons. To follow-up on this finding, a survey question asked if literacy professionals' practices had been influenced by supervising or mentoring novice teachers. More than half of K-12 teachers and reading specialists (62%) agree or strongly agree that supervising and mentoring novice

teachers influences their teaching practice. This finding is significant because of a prevailing assumption that it is the teacher candidates who are learning from mentor teachers not that a mentor teacher learns more about her or his own teaching from working with a student teacher. It would be valuable to have more information on exactly what teachers and reading specialists find influences their teaching practices when they are involved in supervising or mentoring new teachers. It is further worth noting that most administrators (87%) and teacher educators (85%) agree or strongly agree that supervising and mentoring novice teachers has influenced their work as literacy professionals. Not too surprising is that many library media specialists (46%) said this question did not apply to them. Given that so many other literacy professionals report being influenced by participating in mentoring and supervising it might be important to involve more library media specialists in literacy teacher education. It is important to keep in mind, however, that the influence people report experiencing is not necessarily a positive one. The survey question only says "my own practice has been influenced by...." This ambiguity in the wording leads us to be cautious in interpreting the survey results.

Hudson-Ross and Graham (1996) report that the mentor high school teachers met once each quarter in small groups within high schools and as an entire group across schools to consider issues of mentoring and share program experiences. This interaction became an important piece of the teacher education program because mentor teachers "came to rely on one another as resources for mentoring questions, and solidarity across schools continued to grow" (p. 6). A survey question asked whether literacy professionals' practice had been influenced by being a participant in mentor or supervision support meetings. Approximately half (54%) of the K-12 teachers and reading specialists agreed or strongly agreed that this influenced their practice. These data show that support meetings are slightly less influential than is supervising and mentoring novice teachers for most K-12 teachers and specialists. Again the results show that many administrators (80%) and teacher educators (71%) agree to some extent that support meetings have influenced their practice. It is important to consider that what the survey respondents thought of as support meetings probably differs significantly from what the mentor teachers experienced in Hudson-Ross and Graham's research study. It is likely that respondents had in mind the more or less common practice of a teacher educator, a mentor teacher, and a student teacher meeting to review the student teacher's performance and progress in a supportive manner.

Being in touch with beliefs that drive practice. Connecting theory and practice through conducting teacher research was a central tenet of the teacher education program that gave rise to this set of survey questions. The value placed on teacher inquiry was based on the idea that it is important to be aware of what beliefs undergird one's teaching practices. To investigate this basic assumption with other literacy professionals, a survey question asked respondents if getting in touch with beliefs that drive practice has influenced their own practice. Very few literacy professionals disagreed (4%) that knowing about the beliefs that relate

to particular practices influences how one teaches. The fact that most respondents agreed that "getting in touch" or learning about the relationship between beliefs and practices mattered could be interpreted as a vote of confidence for emphasizing theoretical understanding in teacher education and professional development.

Concluding remarks. It is generally understood that many teachers are dissatisfied with their own teacher preparation experiences (Lanier & Little, 1986). And, in the traditional preservice model of teacher education teachers, principals, and university faculty rarely collaborate on curriculum or on what teacher candidates will accomplish during their field experiences (Clift & Say, 1988). Current proposals for reform in teacher education and efforts such as that reported by Hudson-Ross and Graham (1996) are based on the assumption that more collaboration should occur between public school personnel and teacher educators in colleges and universities. The responses to the survey questions about three-way collaboration and experiences with teacher education show that many literacy professionals believe collaboration is important. Yet, many of them have little experience with such collaborations. The majority of respondents report being positively influenced from supervising or mentoring novice teachers but it is likely that this occurred within traditional models of teacher education.

Furthermore, most respondents reported that their own practices as teachers, administrators, and specialists have been influenced by knowing more about the relationship between beliefs and practices. This is interesting given that some empirical research on reading teachers' conceptions and theories of practice reports a lack of correlation between teachers' theoretical orientations and their classroom practices (e.g., Hoffman & Kugle, 1982). While other studies found that the beliefs of reading teachers does account for their classroom practices (e.g., Richardson, Anders, Tidwell, & Lloyd, 1991). The survey results contradict the widely held presumption that most teachers are skeptical or dismissive of the role of beliefs and theory in teaching.

Knowing About and Through Teacher Research

In 1992 a committee comprised of two university professors (JoBeth Allen and James Baumann) and three teacher researchers (Valerie Garfield, Barbara Michalove, and Betty Shockley) began the process of establishing the School Research Consortium (SRC), a self-governed teacher research community. The establishment of the SRC was undertaken to help fulfill the National Reading Research Center's mission to conduct literacy studies that involve teachers as collaborative researchers and to establish research sites where university- and school-based researchers plan, conduct, synthesize, and report research. This mission was based on the idea that when teachers engage in posing and investigating questions about their own teaching and classroom contexts that a natural bridge will occur between practice and theory. The proposal for establishing the National Reading Research Center stated that "teacher inquiry develops ownership of the research questions, enhances

the credibility of the findings, and fosters dissemination" (University of Georgia and University of Maryland, 1991, p. 5).

Over a three-year period the School Research Consortium has involved approximately 35 elementary, middle, and high school teachers from the greater Athens, Georgia area. The research pursued by the members of the SRC has been reported in the NRRC publication series (McWhorter, Jarrard, Rhoades, & Wiltcher, 1996; Weaver & Stanulis, 1996) and in other educational publications (Baumann, 1995; Hankins, 1996; Keffer, Carr, Lanier, Mattison, Wood & Stanulis, 1995). Analyses of teacher methodology and issues facing teacher researchers have also been addressed by members of the SRC community (Baumann, 1996; Baumann, Shockley, & Allen, 1996). The success of the SRC and the growing interest and attention to teacher research (Huberman, 1996; Santa & Santa, 1995; Wilson, 1995; Wong, 1995a) led to the development of questionnaire items that would survey literacy professionals' knowing about and through teacher research. It seemed timely and important to ascertain the extent to which teacher research was known and valued by a broad spectrum of educators. In collaboration with JoBeth Allen, James Baumann, and Betty Shockley, we developed eight questionnaire items. The items on teacher research were prefaced by the following introductory statement:

> Teacher research provides a way for teachers to systematically study their own practice. Teacher researchers raise their own questions, find ways to answer them and use their findings to inform their teaching. Some teacher researchers share what they have learned with local, state, or national audiences.

Results

Familiarity with teacher research. Huberman (1996) claims that "the teacher-research movement in the U.S. now has enough momentum to qualify as a mainstream perspective" (p. 126). He credits the English language arts community with doing much of the "pioneering work of teacher research" (p. 125). Carol and John Santa (1995) write that teacher research has become a "household word" (p. 439) during the past 15 years for literacy professionals who belong to the National Reading Conference, the International Reading Association, and the National Council of Teachers of English. Claims about the prevalence and popularity of teacher research in the U.S. literacy education community have been based on the rise in conference presentations and publications by teacher researchers (Baumann, Allen, & Shockley, 1994). Another means of ascertaining whether teacher research is a "household word" among literacy educators is through a survey questionnaire. We gathered information from respondents on their familiarity with teacher research (see Table 7).

Three-fourths (76%) of the questionnaire respondents said they were "somewhat familiar," "familiar," or "very familiar" with teacher research. Among those who believe themselves to be "very familiar" with teacher research there are some noteworthy differences by occupational role. Almost half of teacher educators (48%) and one-quarter of administra-

tors (25%) are "very familiar." This contrasts sharply with the percentage of elementary (6%), middle (5%), and high school (6%) teachers who claim to be "very familiar." The majority of K through grade 12 teachers, reading specialists, and library media specialists believe themselves to be somewhat familiar or familiar with teacher research. These data support the view that many literacy professionals know about teacher research. It is clear that teacher educators are more aware of developments in teacher research than are other members of the literacy education community.

Interest in teacher research. There are many ways of being familiar with teacher research. One way is to engage in teacher research. Respondents were asked to rate their degree of interest in becoming a teacher researcher (see Table 8). Nearly half of all literacy professionals (49%) said they were either "somewhat interested" or "very interested" in becoming a teacher researcher. It is important to note that more respondents were tentatively interested than enthusiastically interested. And a significant proportion of respondents (26%) are "not at all interested" in becoming teacher researchers. Disinterest is highest among library media specialists and teachers in elementary and middle schools. Lack of interest among library media specialists is not too surprising given that less has been written about how they might participate in research in their school settings. In the School Research Consortium a collaborative study was conducted by two third-grade teachers and a library media specialists (Baumman, Fuentes, & Holman, 1996). Library media specialists may be involved as partners in teacher research or they may conduct their own research within the library media center educational environment.

For those who have already engaged in teacher research there was the opportunity to select the response: "I already consider myself to be teacher researcher." Again one finds notable differences with regard to particular literacy occupations. Far more teacher educators consider themselves to be teacher researchers (60%) than do K through grade 12 teachers (9%-14%). This finding is surprising because teacher research is usually associated with classroom inquiry conducted by elementary, middle, and high school teachers. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993) distinguish teacher research from research on teaching. The latter is typically undertaken by university researchers who study other teachers' pedagogy, practices, and students. Although the literature on teacher research does include self-studies by university and college teachers (e.g., Alvermann, 1996; MacGillivray, & King, 1995), it is assumed that most teacher research is done by teachers of K through grade 12. It is significant that the questionnaire data present a portrait of teacher research being done largely by teacher educators. Of further interest is that more teacher educators claimed to be teacher researchers (n= 124) than claimed to be "very familiar" with teacher research (n = 98). This trend is also true for the other subgroups of literacy professionals with the one exception being administrators. One possible explanation is that one might engage in teacher research but not feel very knowledgeable about the literature on teacher research.

Influence of teacher research. Supporters of teacher research view it as an important means

for building knowledge about teaching and education (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Patterson, Stansell & Lee, 1990). Wilson (1995), in a debate with Wong (1995a; 1995b) over the teacher as researcher, acknowledged that "much of the talk about teachers-as-researchers has focused on questions of knowledge and its production" (p. 19). The significance of teacher research ultimately leads to concerns about who should and can produce knowledge. One way of considering the knowledge produced by teacher researchers is to investigate the extent to which it influences other educators' thinking. To investigate this we asked literacy professionals to indicate the degree to which they agreed that their thinking had been influenced by: (a) reading teacher research; (b) hearing teachers talk about their research; (c) participating in teacher research; (d) supporting colleagues involved in teacher research; (e) writing reports of teacher research; and (f) presenting teacher research at conferences or at their schools (see Table 9).

The results show that more than half of respondents either agree or strongly agree that their thinking has been influenced by reading (69%) and hearing (67%) about teacher research, or by supporting colleagues engaged in teacher research (52%). To a lesser extent respondents agree or strongly agree that participating in teacher research (45%), presenting the results of teacher research (38%), or writing reports of teacher research (30%) have significantly influenced their thinking. It makes sense that presenting and writing about teacher research would be less influential because many respondents have not had the experience of conducting teacher research. The finding that many literacy professionals view teacher research as influential lends support to teacher inquiry as an important contribution to knowledge about teaching and education. What these data do not address is whether teacher research represents "a qualitatively distinctive body of understandings, skills, and dispositions" about educational practice and methodology (Huberman, 1996, p. 124).

An examination of how subgroups of literacy professionals responded to the influence of teacher research is helpful in identifying differences in how this source of knowledge of production is perceived. The percentage of teacher educators (50%), administrators (32%), and reading specialists (27%) who strongly agree that their thinking has been influenced by reading teacher research are significantly higher than they are for K through grade 12 teachers (12–15%) and library media specialists (14%). Differences among literacy professionals are less pronounced when it comes to hearing about or participating in teacher research.

Of interest are the similarities in responses between teacher educators and administrators on supporting colleagues in teacher research and on presenting teacher research as conferences and in schools. Teacher educators and administrators are more likely to strongly agree that these activities have influenced their thinking than do other literacy professionals. They are also more likely to have opportunities to engage in these experiences. Teacher educators have opportunities to support classroom inquiry by teachers who are enrolled in education courses. Administrative approval is usually required when a teacher decides to conduct

classroom research. Thus, administrators are aware of those teachers who are conducting research and endorse it in one way or another.

Concluding remarks. The survey data suggest that many literacy professionals across the United States are: (a) familiar with teacher research, (b) interested in becoming a teacher researcher, and (c) influenced by teacher research. These data support pronouncements that teacher research is a "mainstream perspective" (Huberman, 1996, p. 126), a "household word" (Santa & Santa, 1995, p. 439), or a "new genre" (Baumann, 1996, p. 34). On the other hand, it is important to keep in mind that teacher research is not of interest to every literacy professional. Approximately one-quarter of the survey respondents are "not at all interested" in becoming a teacher researcher. Perhaps, if they gained some familiarity with teacher research, they too would become interested to some extent in participating in teacher research. It is also possible that some literacy professionals are not interested in teacher research because of what they do know about it. The challenges and conflicts that arise in carrying out the dual purposes of teaching and researching have been addressed in the literature on teacher research (Allen & Shockley, 1996; Baumann, 1996; Wong, 1995). Allen and Shockley (1996) write that "new teacher researchers struggle to make research an organic part of their teaching days, examining what they already do, collect, and interpret" and they acknowledge that "many do not feel that synchrony yet" (p. 222). We can only speculate that some respondents are not interested in becoming teacher researchers because they view research as an added burden. One primary grade teacher with eight years experience indicated this by writing next to the items on teacher research, "Agree, although at times these things are just added stressors in an already enormous workload." Further research is needed to understand the reasons why literacy professionals are or are not interested in teacher research.

Knowing About Library Media Specialist Roles

Questionnaire items on school libraries were adapted from a survey research study by DeGroff (1996) on literacy professionals' perceptions of roles and relationships in the school library. In that study, 47 library media specialists, 72 elementary school teachers, and 29 administrators responded to a survey mailed to a national sample. Questionnaire items from the DeGroff study were organized around three roles of the library media specialist as described in *Information Power* (1988), a policy document published by the American Association of School Librarians and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Items distinguished among literacy professionals' responses about the importance of these roles and how these roles were carried out in actual practice in their schools. The three roles examined through questionnaire items in that and the current studies are: (1) information specialist, (2) teacher, and (3) instructional consultant. In addition, both questionnaires posed questions about how teachers and library media specialists communicate in order to advance literacy instruction and voluntary reading.

DeGroff (1996) found that literacy professionals place high value on all three roles. However, she found that library media specialists more often practice the roles of the information specialist and teacher than that of instructional consultant. And when library media specialists practice the role of instructional consultant, they are most likely to be gathering books and other instructional resources. In addition, DeGroff found that communications between library media specialists and teachers were practiced in more casual rather than systematic ways.

Results

Table 10 presents results of the questionnaire as they apply to knowing about all three roles for library media specialist. Roles were not labelled on the questionnaire itself. The first two items, however, reflect the role of the library media specialist as information specialist, the next three items as teacher, and the last three items as instructional consultant.

In the role of information specialist. As information specialist, the librarian provides access to the library, supports flexible scheduling, selects new materials, shares resources, and provides assistance in selecting and locating books and information. Two questionnaire items addressed the role of information specialist. The first item addressed the importance of the library media specialists' role in providing access to the library media center. In theory, the library media center would be open to all children, teachers, and others throughout the day if the library practiced flexible scheduling. Most literacy professionals responding to the questionnaire considered access to the library media center to be "important" (20%) or "very important" (77%). Library media specialists led the way when 91% chose access to be very important; administrators (70%), teacher educators (69%), and primary grade teachers (72%) fell slightly below the group average for rating access as very important.

The second item exploring the role of informational specialist addressed the importance of the library media specialist in providing assistance in locating information. The results here were like those for the previous item. More than three-fourths of all respondents (76%) considered this item to be "very important." Administrators (68%), teacher educators (66%), and primary grade teachers (73%) lagged somewhat behind the average rating for all literacy professionals.

The role of information specialist is the most traditional of the three library media specialist roles. Perhaps that explains in part why this role is so important to literacy professionals. People in general and literacy professionals in particular value the librarian who opens the doors of the library to its users, stocks the shelves with good books, and helps them find what they want to read.

In the role of teacher. When working as teachers, school librarians teach library users how to select and locate books, resources, and information. They support lifelong reading and learning and critical reading and thinking, and they teach appreciation for freedom of information and understanding of and respect for copyright and privacy laws. And finally, librarians are prepared to teach parents techniques for reading with children. Three ques-

tionnaire items examined the role of the library media specialist as teacher. The first item addressed the library media specialist's role in teaching so that students are effective producers and consumers of information. As with the items on the role of information specialist, library media specialists (85%) were ahead of others in finding this role to be "very important." However, the differences among the remaining literacy professionals were very slight. In sum, 70% of literacy professionals highly valued this aspect of the teaching role.

A second item assessed the importance of having the library media specialist instruct or consult with teachers and administrators. Again, library media specialists (77%) found this role to be "very important" more often that did literacy professionals as a whole (56%).

The final item concerning the teaching role asked about the importance of the library media specialist in instructing and consulting with parents. Forty-four percent of literacy professionals believe it to be "important" that the library media specialist instruct or consult with parents, whereas only 21% found this aspect of the library media specialist's role to be "very important." This finding echos one from the DeGroff (1996) study—that working with parents is one of the least valued and least practiced aspects of the library media specialist's work. In fact, 35% of literacy professionals believe that it is "unimportant" or only "somewhat important" that library media specialists work with parents. Given that today's library media specialists are trained to work with parents (*Information Power*, 1988), perhaps we as literacy professionals need to examine ways in which to take advantage of their expertise and maximize their contributions through working with parents.

Literacy professionals value library media specialists as teachers; however, they find this role to be somewhat less important than that of information specialist. DeGroff (1996) found that library media specialists practiced the role of teacher less often than that of information specialist. Dales (1990) makes a case for the importance of "trusting relationships" between teachers and librarians. To do this, she proposes that librarians view themselves more as teachers, and that teachers view the libraries as classrooms. Questionnaire results indicate that literacy professionals as a whole do view library media specialists as teachers. It appears that part of the foundation for "trusting relationships" exists and is ready to be built upon.

In the role of instructional consultant. When school librarians serve as instructional consultants, they participate with teachers in designing, implementing, and assessing lessons, units, and curriculum as a whole. Three questionnaire items examined respondents' interests in the instructional consultant role. The first item assessed the importance of having the library media specialist work with the teacher to develop objectives. Forty-three percent of all literacy professionals found this role to be "important" and 33% found it to be "very important." Forty-eight percent of library media specialists believed it "very important" to work with teachers on objectives; whereas, only 20% to 35% of the teachers believed such work to be very important. Nearly one-fourth (24%) of literacy professionals found such work to be "unimportant" or "somewhat important."

The second item on the role of instructional consultant assessed the importance of having the library media specialist assist in delivering lesson or unit content and activities. Again, many literacy professionals found this role to be "important" (44%) or "very important" (33%). And, once more, the library media specialists were more interested in this work than were other literacy professionals. Fifty percent of the library media specialists rated assisting in delivering instruction as "very important" whereas only 21% to 38% of the remaining literacy professionals expressed similar enthusiasm for this role.

The final item on the role of instructional consultant asked about the importance of having the library media specialist work with teachers to plan for student assessment. Of all the items on the roles of the library media specialist, this one received the least interest. Forty-five percent of respondents rated working on assessment as "unimportant" or "somewhat important." Ratings by library media specialists were much like those by the rest of the literacy professionals although they did lead the way in rating this role as "very important" (30%).

The role of instructional consultant is the least traditional of the three roles and this may explain why it is of somewhat less importance to literacy professionals as a whole. This is also the role that demands the most collaboration with teachers. For the library media specialist to work with the teacher to plan, carry out, and assess instruction, they must have opportunities to communicate with each other. Questionnaire findings about communication may shed some light on views about the librarian as instructional consultant.

Communication between teachers and library-media specialists. Templeton (1990) took an historical look at the relationships between teachers and librarians and concluded that they have been like "two shy children in the school yard, each wishing fully to involve the other in common plan and purpose but usually making, at best, tentative overtures" (p. 776). Based on this observation, it seems possible to believe that teachers and librarians may be having difficulty finding ways to communicate with each other. DeGroff (1996) found that, indeed, communications between teachers and librarians took place in casual rather than systematic ways. This earlier survey asked respondents to report on actual practices for communicating. In comparison, the current questionnaire asked respondents to rate the importance of casual and systematic ways to communicate.

Six items presented a range of ways for teachers and librarians to communicate (see Table 11). Between 41% and 49% of all literacy professionals rated all six ways of communicating as "important." And between 25% and 37% rated these "very important." In sum, literacy professionals valued all ways of communicating and showed very little discrimination among ways. Library media specialists, however, rated each way of communicating as "very important" more often than did any other literacy professionals. One way to interpret this finding would be to believe that library media specialists are somewhat more interested than their colleagues in communicating.

Questionnaire respondents did not show a preference for either casual or systematic ways of communicating. For example, they found brief, unscheduled talks to be as important as having the library media specialist participate in grade level meetings. This finding contrasts with reported practices (DeGroff, 1996). It appears that literacy professionals may be interested in exploring ways of communicating in addition to having brief, unscheduled talks. Meeting at regularly scheduled times, communicating through writing, at faculty meetings, and on planning days are important options for establishing communication between teachers and librarians. It may be that taking advantage of other communication options will be necessary if teachers are to work with library media specialists as instructional consultants. It may be possible for the library media specialist to serve as an information specialist, to recommend a book to a teacher or child, for example, in a brief conversation. But curriculum planning and implementation require more contact. For teachers to work with instructional consultants communication that might best take place during a team or grade level meeting or a planning day.

Concluding remarks. Only 13 respondents wrote comments about school libraries either next to those items or at the end of the questionnaire. Of these, nine informed us that they were library aides rather than trained library media specialists, or that their schools had either part-time or no library media specialists. As is the case with many of the comments provided by respondents, the comments about school libraries remind us that the questionnaire items often deal with ideal worlds, and that the worlds in which many literacy professionals work are less than ideal. The literacy professionals who responded to this questionnaire clearly believe in the importance of all three roles in which today's school library media specialist is prepared to serve. We are reminded, however, that if librarians are to serve in important roles, they must be present in schools.

Knowing About Literature and Culture Through Book Clubs

A three-year study was conducted of four book clubs for literacy educators (Flood, Lapp, Alvarez, Romero, Ranck-Buhr, Moore, Jones, Kabildis, & Lungren, 1994). Participants included 24 teachers and administrators within the San Diego Unified School District, and 14 preservice teachers and two professors from San Diego State University. Book club participants represented four primary cultural groups: European American, Mexican American, African American, and Asian American.

The purpose of these book clubs was to read and discuss multicultural literature as a means of enhancing awareness of feelings about other cultures, knowledge of other cultures, and idiosyncrasies within cultures. The development of knowledge of multicultural concerns was deemed important in providing appropriate instruction for children from a variety of cultures. Four research questions guided the study of book clubs:

1) How do participants come to know and grow in their knowledge of multiculturalism?

2) How do participants articulate knowledge about the ways in which they read and respond to stories?

3) How do participants transform experience as active participants in a book club to actions in their own classrooms?

4) How do participants communicate with their peers in a discussion group?

Analyses and interpretation of data led the researchers to conclude that "increased understandings about multiculturalism were evidenced by everyone. The selected texts served as springboards for reflecting on and sharing personal experiences" (Flood et al., 1994, p. 22). The book club discussions dealt with cultural stereotypes, prejudices, and differences. To further investigate the potential of book clubs as a means for promoting multicultural awareness in school practices and curriculum a set of 14 items was designed for the survey questionnaire. The items seek information about literacy professionals' experiences with adult book clubs and the use of book clubs with school children. A subset of items specifically address the potential of book clubs in knowing about issues of cultural diversity. The following was used to introduce the book club items to respondents.

> The following questions ask about "book clubs." Book clubs are groups that meet to read and discuss works of literature. Book clubs may be known by other names such as "literature study groups" or "literature circles."

Results

Experience with book clubs. Two questions sought information about literacy professionals experience with book clubs. They were asked about their own participation in an adult book club (see Table 12). And they were asked if they used book clubs in their classrooms. More than half (56%) of literacy professionals have never participated in an adult book club. Whereas, approximately one-third (33%) of respondents said they frequently or very frequently use book clubs in their classrooms. The highest percentage of respondents who said they "never" used book clubs were high school teachers (61%) and library media specialists (62%). This is somewhat surprising given that being a member of book club would be quite feasible for high school students who for the most part are beyond needing instruction in word identification and other aspects of elementary reading. It is further interesting to note that the highest percentage of literacy professionals who reported frequently or very frequently participating in an adult book club were high school teachers (21%). So why do not more of the high school teachers who participate in book clubs use them with their students? Conversely, one can ask why so many elementary school teachers report using book clubs in their classrooms when the majority (64%) of them have never participated in an adult book club. With regard to the library media specialists it is somewhat disappointing to learn that many have not adopted the book club concept because it would be a logical component of a library school program.

Beliefs about book clubs. Seven statements about book clubs for adults or children were presented in the questionnaire. Literacy professionals were asked to indicate whether they disagreed or agreed with each one. There was a discernible trend among those respondents who selected "strongly agree" toward viewing the book clubs as more advantageous for chil-

dren than adults. More respondents strongly agree (29%) that book clubs offer important ways for children to learn about literature than they do in adult book clubs (15%). More respondents strongly agree that book clubs provide valuable insights into how children respond to literature (29%) than into how adults respond to literature (17%). And more respondents agree or strongly agree (77%) that they would be interested in using book clubs with children than agree or strongly agree that they would be interested in joining an adult book club (51%). They are far less interested in belonging to adult book clubs than they are in using them in their classrooms. This is interesting in light of the study that gave rise to these questions. In the Flood et al. study (1994), adults found that belonging to a book club informed their work as educators. Too often in education we introduce learning experiences to students that we have little experience with ourselves as learners. This has been noted with other educational innovations, such as writing workshop. Teachers who have little experience as writers and with writing as a process can become more knowledgeable about what to expect from students after belonging to their own writer's workshop (Keffer et al., 1995).

Generally, there was significant enthusiasm for using book clubs in literacy education. Slightly more than three-fourths (77%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that "book clubs offer powerful tools to transform teaching." The source of literacy professionals' interest and endorsement of book clubs for students is unclear. It could be due to the recent proliferation of research on book clubs as an alternative to basal reading group instruction (McMahon, 1992; Goatley, Brock, & Raphael, 1995), and other literature that translates research into pedagogical recommendations for implementing book clubs (McMahon, Raphael, & Goatley, 1995; Raphael & McMahon, 1994). An alternative hypothesis is that the book club concept makes intuitive sense to educators. Encouraging students to get together and discuss their understandings, impressions, and puzzlements about a reading selection may seem obviously valuable to educators. Nevertheless, we must not lose sight of the fact that while three-fourths of respondents said book clubs could transform teaching there also were high percentages of respondents (67%) who "never" or "seldom" used book clubs in their classrooms.

Book clubs and cultural diversity. Four questionnaire items sought information on the frequency with which educators were addressing issues of cultural diversity in book clubs for adults and children. Respondents were asked how often they "read books by or about people from other cultures in an adult book club" and how often they "encourage the reading of books by and about people of other cultures in book clubs for children." Comparing responses on these two items supports an earlier trend in the data on book clubs. A larger percentage of respondents said they "frequently" encouraged reading about people from other cultures in book clubs for children (40%) than they did themselves in adult book club (16%). The same trend holds for the other two parallel items on discussing issues of cultural diversity in adult book clubs versus children's book clubs. One-third of literacy professionals (34%) report "frequently" dis-

cussing issues in book clubs in their classroom while only 12% "frequently" do this in an adult book club. These data reveal that book clubs for children are being used in some classrooms to learn about people from different cultures and to address issues that arise in a multicultural society. Few literacy professionals are having book club experiences that focus on readings and discussions like those researched by Flood, Lapp, and their colleagues.

Use of multicultural literature. One questionnaire item was included that did not pertain specifically to book clubs but did focus on the use of literature in the classroom that represents different cultures. Specifically, respondents were asked how often they "select multicultural literature as part of an instructional theme or unit." Results show that many literacy professionals (66%) are using multicultural literature with students. Responses to this item suggest that the use of multicultural literature is more common than is the use of book clubs and the use of book clubs that focus on issues of cultural diversity.

Concluding remarks. Book clubs are a recent innovative practice. Questionnaire results indicate that this practice has taken some hold, but it is still not in widespread use. How then might literacy professionals come to know more about book clubs and the promise they hold? One possibility is that they would use what they know about book clubs based on their own participation in such groups. Although this may be a desirable option that would bring authenticity to one's concept of the book club experience, it does not seem a likely path for many literacy professionals. Seventy-seven percent of respondents professed interest in book clubs for children, yet 56% have never had such an experience as adult readers. This means a sizable portion of literacy professionals would be unable to draw upon their own experiences in book clubs. Reading professional literature and hearing about book clubs from literacy colleagues is another option for learning about this innovative practice. Those who write and speak about book club practices may want to pay special attention to teachers who are seeking to provide experiences for their students that they have not had themselves. In addition, it is unlikely that most teachers will be able to draw upon their own experiences in order to use multicultural literature to explore issues of diversity. Resources that inform teachers of this practice will be important options for coming to know about the potential of book clubs for developing mulitcultural understandings.

And, of course, there is a third option to learning about book clubs and multicultural opportunities within book clubs. That is to do what Flood and Lapp and their colleagues (1994) have done. Teachers on their own or in collaboration with other literacy professionals such as teacher educators can give themselves book club experiences now.

Knowing About and Through Portfolio Assessment

Kieffer and Faust (1994) write that the "portfolio process offers a way of evaluating students that may also become an important catalyst for teacher change" (p. 84). In 1990 Valencia accurately predicted that many different iterations of a portfolio approach to literacy

assessment would be undertaken, but what really mattered was the mindset that portfolios would instill in students and teachers. Using portfolios to document meaningful authentic literacy learning is intended to lead both teachers and students to become more reflective and knowledgeable about themselves and their learning process (Darling-Hammond & Ancess, 1993). Considerable interest in literacy portfolios as an alternative form of assessment is evidenced by the proliferation of articles, books, and book chapters published on the subject.

The survey questionnaire items on portfolio assessment were created in consultation with Ron Kieffer who, along with his teacher educator colleague Mark Faust, collaborated with second-grade teacher Linda Morrison and high school English teacher Cheryl Hilderbrand on a study of the process of teachers using portfolios with students and on the process of teachers creating their own portfolios (Kieffer & Faust, 1994; Kieffer, Faust, Morrison, & Hilderbrand, 1996a; Kieffer, Faust, Morrison, & Hilderbrand, 1996b). The yearlong study was both a self-study by the researchers and involved 17 other elementary, middle, and high school teachers interested in implementing portfolio assessment in their classrooms. Data collection involved interviewing teachers and students, conducting surveys (pre and post), and taking observational notes in classrooms, and transcribing interactive research team sessions. The analysis of data focused on understanding the relationship between teacher change and the portfolio process.

The researchers found that "portfolio use can be linked to teacher change if questions about methodology do not overshadow questions about the purposes driving particular evaluation and grading practices" (Kieffer & Faust, 1994, p. 87). Specifically, the research findings show that the portfolio process begins with questions about purpose and audience and questions about what children are learning and why. The process of creating a portfolio also leads to questions about collection, selection for inclusion, and organization. Reflection is encouraged as teachers and students examine literacy processes, evaluate themselves, set new goals, and document progress. Teacher-created portfolios were useful in modeling the process for students and fostered knowledge of the self as teacher and as learner. And, finally, teachers' knowledge of instructional practices was enhanced by attending to the voices of students, peer teachers, and parents. Findings from this study of portfolios and an awareness that portfolio assessment was an important trend in literacy education were further investigated through 13 questionnaire items.

Results

Experience with portfolios. Wolf and Siu-Runyan (1996) assert that portfolios have in a ten-year period moved from "innovation to convention" (p. 30). To support that they cite published accounts of portfolio use at the national, state, and district, school, and classroom level across the United States. They also acknowledge that within the literature on portfolios there are different models of implementation. The survey questionnaire provides a unique opportunity to test the perception that portfolio assessment has moved from innova-

tion to convention while also gathering data on what portfolio models have been used. A questionnaire item on experience with portfolio assessment began as follows:

> There are many forms of portfolio assessment being tried in education. Select the statement that *best* represents your experience with portfolio assessment. (Circle only one.)

Table 15 reports the percentage of respondents who report experience with: (a) portfolios designed by someone *other* than the teacher and student; (b) portfolios designed by a teacher *for* his or her students; (c) portfolios designed by a teacher *and* his or her students; and (d) portfolios designed primarily *by the students*. There was also a response option for those with no experience with portfolios.

Many literacy professionals (73%) have had experience with portfolios. Those who chose to comment on the portfolio items reveal that the portfolio experience is indeed different depending on context. For example, one teacher educator explained that "as an elementary school teacher, I kept portfolios *years* before it was popular to do so. I believed in it then and I believe in it now—in an arena in which I see kids and monitor progress *every day*. Currently, as a university professor I am forced to fabricate portfolios for advisees I have never had in class and barely know. The process is ludicrious and the antithesis of what is intended in portfolio work." Almost all teacher educators (94%) report having experience with portfolios whereas less than one-half of library media specialists (41%) report having experience with them. One library media specialist with 11 years experience explained in a marginal note why she did not respond to any of the portfolio items: "I don't know what it is. Can't answer these questions." While another media specialist with 14 years experience indicated her familiarity with portfolios by writing at the end of her questionnaire, "I like a combination of portfolios and assessment because the portfolio authenticates the other assessment. Having the familiar assessment helps communicate with distrustful parents."

Slightly more administrators (86%) and reading specialists (81%) report having experience than do teachers in grades K–12 (73%). It is important to recognize that among K–12 teachers that more middle school teachers (32%) report having no experience with portfolios than do their elementary (26%) and high school (22%) colleagues. A high school teacher who is very interested in portfolios implies that her experience and interest are due to her affiliation with the Southcentral Pennsylvania Writing Project. She writes, "I want to do more with portfolios but am overwhelmed by the issues.... Evaluation time particularly. Now they are a measure of growth for the kids rather than for me."

For the most part the literacy professionals report that their experiences with portfolios have primarily involved them designing portfolios for students (29%) or designing portfolios with their students (26%). Very few respondents (9%) indicated that portfolios designed by someone other than the teacher and students best represented their experience. This finding suggests that commercially available portfolios or those created and mandated by district or state administrators are not what most literacy professionals are experiencing. On the other

hand, one primary grade reading specialist whose experience has been with portfolios designed by someone other than the teacher and students wrote positively and at length about her experience with Kentucky's state-wide portfolio initiative to support her view that "portfolios [should be used] as a tool for instruction rather than assessment."

The data also reveal that very few literacy professionals (8%) are allowing portfolios to be primarily designed by the students. Seventeen percent of teacher educators selected this option, however. This makes sense in that teacher educators work with adult students and may be more likely than other literacy professionals to give responsibility to students for designing their own portfolios. Responses to this item on experience lends support to the prevailing view that portfolio assessment has arrived in many U.S. classrooms.

Interest in portfolio assessment. Table 16 reports the percentage of literacy professionals who are not interested, somewhat interested, interested, and very interested in using portfolio assessment. Interest in using portfolio assessment is yet another way of gauging attitudes toward this innovation in literacy assessment. The results show that literacy professionals for the most part have some degree of interest in using portfolios for assessment. With the exception of library media specialists (22%) few respondents (9%) said they were "not interested." Some of the respondents not interested in portfolio assessment offered comments. One reading specialist noted on her questionnaire that "portfolios aren't really relevant to my teaching situation." Another library media specialist who was not interested rhetorically asked, "How do portfolios get students into the top universities?" And an elementary teacher who has been in education for 30 years wrote on her questionnaire that "portfolios are busywork as my colleagues all agree." This respondent selected "strongly disagree" for all the portfolio items and had no experience with portfolio assessment.

The degree of interest varies some by occupation. More teacher educators and administrators report being "very interested" than do other professionals. Reading specialists and high school teachers are more likely to be very interested than are elementary or middle school teachers. An elementary school teacher who said he was interested in portfolio assessment added in a note that, "If I thought it would be followed through in 6–8 [grades], I'd be very interested." A primary grade teacher who selected "somewhat interested" wrote "as far as portfolio assessment goes—currently I cannot imagine doing that and running a hands on program with no planning time and 30 kids!" A comment by a high school teacher may be an important hint about the future of portfolio assessment. This 16-year veteran selected "somewhat interested" but wrote "I am very interested but am losing interest." Despite some negative attitudes toward portfolios the data on interest further support the prevailing view that portfolio assessment matters to those involved in literacy education.

Portfolio influence on practice. One of the purposes of conducting the literacy survey was to learn more about how literacy professionals come to know things that influence their practices. A set of five questionnaire items asked respondents the extent to which they agreed or

disagreed that various experiences related to portfolios had influenced their practice (see Table 17). Results are reported from most to least influential.

Almost three-fourths (73%) of literacy professionals agree or strongly agree that reading about portfolio assessment has influenced their practice. There is also a sizable percentage of respondents (68%) who agree or strongly agree that attending staff development or conference presentations or workshops on portfolio assessment has been influential. Almost as many respondents (61%) also report that implementing portfolio assessment with their students has influenced their practices. Far fewer agree that creating a teacher portfolio (33%) or creating a portfolio for a college or university course (28%) has influenced their practice. This is in part explained by the percentage of respondents who said creating teacher portfolios did not apply to them. One high school teacher who said creating a teacher portfolio did not apply to her also wrote next to the item, "good idea!" In sum, reading about portfolios, attending informative sessions on portfolios, or using them in one's classroom seem most likely to be viewed as having an influence on one's practices as a literacy educator.

Beliefs about portfolio assessment. Table 18 reports on literacy professionals' reactions to statements constructed from interviews with teachers using portfolio assessment. To investigate if educators across the United States were arriving at similar conclusions about portfolio assessment, a set of six belief statements were presented that represent key ideas expressed by participants in the Kieffer et al. (1996a; 1994) portfolio study.

Four of the six belief statements received strong endorsements in that three-fourths or more of the respondents found them agreeable. They are:

- Portfolios allow teachers to pay attention to process and progress instead of a final outcome.
- Portfolio assessment effectively documents growth over time.
- Portfolios is a means for gaining valuable knowledge about instructional practice.
- Teachers can effectively demonstrate portfolio processes by creating their own portfolios.

It is the teacher educators who more often said they strongly agreed with these statements. Among the other groups of literacy professionals approximately half of respondents chose simply to agree with them.

The statement that "portfolios are more useful as learning tools than as assessment tools" received mixed reviews. Across all groups of literacy professionals there were somewhat more responses that agreed than disagreed. But the sizable minority of respondents (39%) that disagreed is important. These results suggest that literacy professionals are split with regard to the purpose of portfolios. Are they primarily helpful in getting students and their teachers to focus on learning or are they mainly a means for assessing literacy learning?

The least favored statement was that "portfolios should replace other measures of assessment and evaluation" (e.g., standardized tests, grades, etc.). More than half (63%) of literacy

professionals disagreed with this idea. A high school teacher with 28 years of employment in education disagreed with this statement but added in a note "only if teachers have a secretary or extra planning time." Another respondent noted that she would "prefer a balance of both." It seems likely that other literacy professionals might endorse a combination of alternative forms of assessments and conventional forms of evaluation. The unacceptability of using portfolios instead of grades and tests for the majority of educators is not surprising.

What is worth further consideration is that a substantial minority of respondents did agree with this radical statement about portfolios. The minority percentage is highest for high school teachers (39%), teacher educators (39%), and teachers in grades K–2 (36%). And approximately one-fourth of the other literacy professionals also agreed or strongly agreed. A primary grade teacher who agreed added this caveat, "possibly; but adequate training would be necessary first."

Concluding remarks. Johns and Van Leirsburg (1992) report the results of two survey studies on how professionals view portfolio assessment. In one 1990 study 128 educators were surveyed and in the second 1991 study 173 educators participated. Johns and Van Leirsburg found that familiarity with portfolios had increased from the first to the second study. In the second survey about one-fourth of the elementary, secondary, reading, and other educators were using portfolios as a tool of reading and writing assessment. The survey data reported here was collected in 1996 and 1,394 literacy professionals responded to the item on experience with portfolios. A dramatic increase in familiarity is evidenced by the 73% of literacy educators who report having experience with some form of portfolios. This increase in experience coupled with the fact that 90% of respondents expressed some degree of interest in using portfolio assessment can be interpreted as a good indicator that alternative assessment may succeed. Worthen (1993) predicts that "if the alternative assessment movement is to succeed, it must have the support and involvement of a large and well-informed cadre of professional educators" (p. 447). Evaluating the extent to which literacy professionals are well-informed is more difficult given the data reported here. The data suggest that many literacy professionals are reading about portfolios and attending staff development, conference presentations, or workshops on portfolio assessment. These activities, along with direct classroom experience, are generally viewed as primary means for becoming well-informed on educational theory and practice.

Johns and Van Leirsburg (1992) also concluded that "educators at all levels in our survey have become more aware of the literacy portfolio as an assessment tool" (p. 10). A related but different finding in this survey comes from responses to an item on whether portfolios are more useful as learning tools than as assessment tools. Approximately half of the literacy professionals agreed that portfolios are more useful as learning tools. One possible interpretation is that educators are shifting in their views of the purposes and benefits of portfolios. Perhaps the experiences that literacy professionals are having with portfolios are leading them to focus more on

how they affect teaching and learning processes. For example, Hilderbrand, a teacher researcher on the case study of portfolios, explains why she views portfolios as a learning tool that promote reflective thinking:

> In order to grow and be ready for these profound experiences and be open to them, you have to have established the process of self-evaluation and looking at yourself—where am I and what am I doing, and maybe that's the most important part of portfolio, getting back to reflection ... because some people go through their life just totally unaware that they can make any changes in themselves. (Kieffer, Faust, Morrison, & Hilderbrand, 1996b, p. 12)

In concluding their discussion of how professionals view portfolio assessment, Johns and Van Leirsburg (1992) speculate that "with greater knowledge and more widespread use, the literacy portfolio will replace standardized tests as classrooms reflect assessment grounded in practice" (p. 10). This view of portfolios seems less certain in light of two findings. The first is that the majority of literacy professionals have knowledge, experience, and interest in portfolios. The second is that *only* one-third of literacy professionals agreed that portfolio assessment should replace standardized measures of assessments such as tests or grades. It will be important to monitor the future of portfolios as assessment tools to see if they are becoming more important to educators as a mechanism to transform teaching practices and classroom learning experiences.

Knowing About Home and School Literacy Connections

A three-year longitudinal study titled the Early Childhood Project was conducted to investigate factors affecting children's transition from home to school (Baker et al., 1994; Sonnenschein et al., 1996). The participants were 42 African American and European American families who reside in low- or middle-income neighborhoods in Baltimore, Maryland. Qualitative and quantitative research methods were employed to pursue the hypothesis that "children from different sociocultural groups may have different home experiences because of characteristics of their niche (such as parental beliefs about child development, available material resources, and general activity patterns of the family) that can lead to differences in subsequent reading development" (Sonnenschein et al., 1996, p. 1).

When the children were in pre-kindergarten their primary caregivers kept a diary for a 1-week period on the children's activities and experiences (Baker et al., 1994). Caregivers also completed an ecological inventory as a follow-up to the diary (Sonnenschein, Baker, & Serpell, 1995). The data collected on print-related experiences in the home was used to identify three complementary themes about emergent literacy. They were endorsed to different degrees by the families.

- Literacy is a source of entertainment; book reading itself is fun, and there are many other enjoyable activities in which literacy plays a role.
- Literacy consists of a set of skills that should be deliberately cultivated; children should be given opportunities to practice their emerging competencies.
- Literacy is an intrinsic ingredient of everday life; by virtue of participation in their daily lives routines such as shopping and food preparation, children

> come to see the functional value of literacy. (Serpell, Baker, & Sonnenschein, 1995, p. 5)

In a subsequent study the children were tested on 14 early literacy-related competencies (Sonnenschein et al., 1996). The results of this assessment was analyzed in conjunction with prior data on family orientations toward the three emergent literacy themes. Results show that living in a family that views literacy as a source of entertainment is correlated with the development of literacy-related skills. And there was a significant negative correlation between a skills orientation and phonological awareness. Given the opportunity to survey a national sample of literacy professionals about results related to the Early Childhood Project, the researchers decided it was important to get reactions to the three emergent literacy themes they had identified from studying family practices. Questionnaire items about the themes were introduced as follows:

> In a recent research project, families of young children voiced the following three themes in discussions about how and why children become literate or learn to read. Do you agree or disagree with these themes?

Another area of investigation in the Early Childhood Project focused on parental perspectives on child development, care, and education. The analysis yielded parental socialization goals and information on the acceptable forms of behavior and the emergent skills and knowledge children bring to school based on home experiences. The researchers were interested in surveying literacy professionals' beliefs about four areas of learning identified as important to parents that pertain to social and academic goals. Questionnaire respondents were asked to use a five-point continuum to indicate the extent to which the home and the school have responsibility for four aspects of childrens learning (see Table 20). The data collected on home and school connections were deemed important given the recommendations in the literature that children do best when there is a match between the home and school in terms of practices, expectations, and even instructional style (Au & Mason, 1981; Heath, 1983; Tharp, 1989).

Results

Beliefs about three literacy themes. Serpell and colleagues (1995) report that the emphasis given to literacy as a source of entertainment, literacy as a skill to be learned, and literacy as an integral ingredient of everyday life varied among the caregivers in their study. The questionnaire results also reveal differences in how literacy professionals think about these three themes (see Table 19). Three-fourths of literacy professionals "strongly agree" that "literacy should be taught as an integral ingredient of our everyday lives." Considerably fewer literacy professionals "strongly agree" that literacy should be taught "as a source of entertainment" (36%) or as "a skill to be learned" (30%). Comparing literacy professionals responses to the themes with those of caregivers is complicated by the fact that the researchers found socioeconomic differences between the way families prepare their children for literacy (Baker et al., 1994). Middle-income families tend to engage in activities that represent literacy as a source of entertainment, whereas

low-income families give more attention to activities that represent literacy as a skill to be learned. Furthermore, the researchers conclude after analyzing data collected in the home and at school over a two-year period that "children do better when they are exposed to an entertainment orientation" regardless of socioeconomic status (Sonnenschein et al., 1996, p. 36). The researchers learned through interviews with the children's teachers that they endorsed all three themes for their kindergarten students. They reported using classroom activities consistent with each theme but considered literacy as a skill to be learned the least relevant for their students (Sonnenschein et al., 1996, p. 37). Similar attitudes are evident in the survey data with the major difference being a much stronger endorsement for teaching literacy as an integral ingredient of everyday life than as a skill or source of entertainment.

Beliefs about home and school involvement. In children's first few years of schooling they learn to negotiate the differences between their home culture and the culture of school (Serpell et al., 1995). Analyses of the meanings caregivers attribute to the significance of their children's everyday activities reveal that some parents place more emphasis on social/moral development while others emphasize personal, intellectual, or academic goals (Serpell et al., 1995). Questionnaire items were designed to solicit information on what literacy professionals believe is the role of home and/or school with regard to children learning: (a) right from wrong (moral development); (b) about the physical world: food, human body, seasons, machines, TV, transportation, etc. (general knowledge); (c) to communicate effectively with others (intellectual development); and (d) to read and write (academic development). Five response options were available: home only, more home than school, home and school equally, more school than home, or school only. The response options were presented in a continuum format.

Most respondents think that the home and school share equal responsibility for the four learning goals identified in the questionnaire. Almost 80% of the literacy professionals think that home and school share equal responsibility for children learning to communicate effectively with others. Not too surprisingly a significant minority of respondents give the home more responsibility for children learning right from wrong (28%). Of interest is that more than one-third (39%) of literacy professionals give more responsibility to schools for children learning reading and writing. It is evident that the majority of literacy professionals expect parents and caregivers to play a significant role in children's literacy development.

Concluding remarks. Literacy professionals who work with children at all grade levels agree that literacy should be taught as a source of entertainment, as a skill, and as an integral ingredient of everyday life. The strongest endorsement, though, is for teaching literacy as an integral ingredient in our everyday lives. What remains unclear is what literacy professionals have in mind when they think about teaching that treats literacy as an integral ingredient of everyday life. This could be viewed as support for teaching that follows from the philosophy of whole language, which emphasizes authentic communicative experiences with text (Goodman, 1986; Weaver,

1988). But the data cannot be interpreted that simplistically because other survey results show that 82% of respondents support an eclectic approach to literacy instruction that combines both basic skills and methods that represent a whole language philosophy. The fact that 53% "agree" and another 30% "strongly agree" that literacy should be taught as a skill suggests that, for many literacy professionals, it may not be acceptable to divide reading, writing, and speaking skills from learning to use language to accomplish personally meaningful language communication. The survey data seem to support the idea that most literacy professionals accept an eclectic approach to literacy instruction (Cunningham, 1991; McKenna, Stahl, & Reinking, 1994). More detailed information is needed on what literacy teachers think constitutes teaching literacy as an integral ingredient in everyday life.

The survey results suggest that teachers and other school personnel would like parents and other caregivers to assume at least half of the responsibility for educating their children. This may represent literacy professionals acceptance of educational studies that report that "variations among family backgrounds make more difference in achievement than do variations among schools ... [and] that schools, of whatever quality, are more effective for children from strong family backgrounds than for children from weak ones (Coleman, 1987, p. 35). A positive interpretation of the survey results is that literacy professionals want to share responsibility with parents and caregivers by entering into more collaborative efforts based on respect for home and school influences. A cynical interpretation would be that literacy professionals are abdicating responsibility for successfully teaching all children to be literate by assigning the home equal responsibility for this accomplishment or its failure.

Issues of home and school responsibilities in educating children are receiving more attention than ever in the professional literature. Casanova (1996) acknowledges that the value of parental involvement has become an acceptable truism for conservatives, liberals, religious fundamentalists, and secular families in the U.S. Although there seems to be a newfound appreciation for the contributions that parents, families, and communities make to the process of becoming educated, Casanova warns that we should not "romanticize parent involvement and proclaim its virtues without also acknowledging its excesses" (p. 31). The excesses of parental involvement for some educators occurs when parents try to exercise absolute control over the curriculum, who will teach their children, how much homework will be assigned, and so forth (Casanova, 1996). The literacy professionals' strong endorsement for what children learn at home with regard to literacy as well as social and moral implications for literacy needs further investigation. It will be important to delineate what kinds of home and school collaborations will be acceptable to all parties and best serve the children's education.

Knowing About Gender Issues

The questionnaire items on gender and teaching come from a study that was conducted to explore ways that university- and school-based teachers might begin to alter or interrupt

discursive practices that have in the past permitted inequities in classroom talk about texts to go unexamined and unchanged (Alvermann et al., 1996). Discursive practices refer to the explicit and implicit expectations and conventions that govern how we learn to think, act, and speak in the various social positions that we occupy in life. The study focused on social positions related to gender and how investigating those positions in one university classroom and two middle school language arts classrooms revealed power relations that influence what occurs or does not occur during text-based classroom discussions. A number of issues and ideas related to the study seemed important to pursue with a national sample of literacy educators.

Results

Interest in knowing about gender issues. First and foremost, it seemed important to ascertain the degree of interest in gender issues among literacy professionals. Is interest in gender and literacy one that is primarily held by researchers who are publishing on the topic (e.g., Alvermann & Commeyras, 1994; Finders, 1996; Orellana, 1995)? The extent of interest was examined in the questionnaire by asking: "How interested are you in knowing about gender issues in literacy education?" Responses to this question show that there is some degree of interest (from somewhat interested, to interested, to very interested) among 86% of literacy professionals (see Table 21). By looking at cross tabulation of the responses to the interest item by sex of respondents we determined that some degree of interest in knowing about gender was expressed by 80% of male respondents and by 86% of female respondents. Therefore, we concluded that it was coincidental that 86% of respondents were female and 86% of respondents were interested in knowing about gender issues.

Most of the literacy professionals (66%) chose to portray themselves as either "somewhat interested" or "interested" in knowing about gender issues. Those who are "very interested" (20%) were fewer in number and varied considerably across the subgroups of literacy professionals. For example, 33% of teacher educators are very interested whereas only 13% of those who teach in kindergarten through second grade claim the same degree of interest. A question that arises from these differences is: Why does the percentage of those very interested in gender increase by grade level taught? There is still much to be learned about why literacy professionals are interested in gender issues and exactly what they are interested in knowing more about. The fact that this degree of interest exists is noteworthy and should be encouraging to those who are studying gender issues in literacy education.

Knowing about gender and sex. Another issue of importance during the Alvermann et al. study (1996) was defining gender and how to use it analytically. The researchers adopted the view that gender is the social and cultural meanings attributed to differences between the sexes and that these meanings are representative of power relations. This led to studying relationships between: (a) teacher and students; (b) talkative and silent students; and (c) students for whom English is a first language and

students for whom it is a second language. While this approach was grounded in attending to differences between males and females it was framed in the broader context of understanding power differentials in the classroom.

In most of the recent literature on gender and education there is a distinction made between the terms "sex" and "gender." For example, in the introduction to the much publicized report on *How Schools Shortchange Girls* (American Association of University Women, 1995) the authors attempt to "use *sex* only when referring to individuals as biologically female or male, and *gender* when also referring to different sets of expectations and limitations imposed by society on girls and boys simply because they are female or male" (p. 5). Given the growing attention and legitimation of a distinction in the meanings of *sex* and *gender*, we designed a questionnaire item to gather information on the extent to which literacy professionals think sex versus gender accounts for the behavior of boys and girls. Questionnaire respondents were asked to select a position on a five-point continuum that would best represent whether the behavior of boys and girls was influenced by biological and physiological determinants (sex), by social and cultural determinants (gender), or by some combination of both. Most respondents chose one of two points on the continuum (see Table 22).

Approximately half (53%) of the people chose the midpoint that represents the view that biology and physiology are as important as social and cultural factors in determining the behavior of boys and girls. Approximately another third (36%) chose the point that gives slightly more credit to social and cultural influences. These findings were consistent across the subgroups of literacy professionals.

Teaching scenarios. Seven teaching scenarios were used in the questionnaire to gather information on literacy professionals' disposition toward ways of addressing gender issues during instruction. The scenarios come from what the teachers in the Alvermann et al. study (1996) reported doing to introduce gender issues into classroom talk about text. The survey researchers believed it important to collect information about how other literacy educators viewed a variety of ways of dealing with gender issues in the classroom, because in the Alvermann et al. study (1996) the teachers had different reactions to their own efforts in taking up gender in discussions of text. For example, the eighth-grade teacher was less confident and comfortable with her efforts to get students talking about gendered language than was the seventh-grade male teacher.

Questionnaire respondents were asked to assume that they were a middle or high school teacher and to select one of four options that indicated how likely they would be to engage in each teaching scenario. Table 23 reports the percentage of respondents who chose: (a) "I would never do this"; (b) "It's unlikely I would do this"; (c) "I might do this"; or (d) "I would very much like to do this."

There are four scenarios for which a sizable proportion of respondents said they "would very much like to do this." It is interesting to consider why some scenarios have greater appeal than others to educators. Educators were least enthusiastic about: (a) the scenario that called for discussions of sexist language; (b) the scenario where a non-traditional school

text (Archie comic books) was used to examine how males and females are portrayed; and (c) the scenario that encouraged boys and girls to identify with characters of their sex during a class discussion. What is it about these three scenarios that differentiate them from the four scenarios that educators were more favorably disposed toward? We offer some speculative answers.

The three least favored scenarios focus more explicitly on gender than do the other four scenarios. It is potentially controversial to explicitly draw students into discussions of sexist language, comic book portrayals of males and females, and same-sex identification with fictional characters. Educators have reason to fear discussions that lead to passionate arguments among students. One respondent, who teaches in the primary grades, circled the words "sexist language" and wrote this comment: "Why encourage the problems between the sexes?" This is a respondent who was "not interested" in knowing about gender issues, has been employed in education for 23 years, and was self-identifed as a "Bible Believing Baptist." This person also wrote at the end of the questionnaire "Get back to 'American' cultures founded in 1620." This respondent's comment lends some support to the hypothesis that certain teaching scenarios addressed topics that made educators uncomfortable. Indeed, this issue arose during the original research on classroom talk about texts. For example, there was a discussion by seventh-graders of a story about a female protagonist who wanted to join a boys' soccer team. In analyzing what occurred, the researchers concluded that "the proverbial battle lines between the sexes were redrawn as each side tried to outshout and exclude the other" (Alvermann et al., 1996, p. 15). One way to avoid class discussions dissolving into a battle between the sexes would be to use an idea one teacher educator offered on her questionnaire. She suggested that teachers switch the gender identification so that boys think about a story from a female character's perspective, and girls consider the same story from a male character's perspective. This is a respondent who was "interested" in knowing about gender issues in literacy education.

Two of the four scenarios that educators preferred do not deviate from what is commonly viewed as appropriate curriculum for middle and high school teaching. Reading *To Kill a Mockingbird* and reading a story of a solitary, self-sufficient woman are acceptable school-type texts. The discussion ideas presented for each text seem less likely to lead to divisive discussions. One can imagine a discussion of what it was like for Atticus Finch to be a man in the 1930s that would not offend or threaten the comfort zones of both students and their teachers. Although one African American reading specialist, who was "very interested" in gender issues, wrote that she would change "man" to "black man." The researchers found that when discussions mixed issues of race and class with gender that students' talk grew "passionate" (Alvermann et al., 1996, p. 20). Thus, it is possible to imagine ways in which the more acceptable teaching scenarios could lead to volatile student discussions of text.

Thinking of questions to ask the solitary, independent woman does not obviously lead to divisive talk between the sexes or to issues of sexism. One can imagine posing questions that

seemingly have little to do with gender. The perception that these two teaching scenarios are less likely to lead to controversial discussions might account for the fact that 90% to 94% of respondents said they "might" or "would very much like" to engage in these kind of instructional experiences.

We propose a different explanation for the remaining two scenarios that many educators found acceptable. One scenario focuses on monitoring equal participation by males and females in discussions and the other scenario proposes including the works of those men and women considered non-mainstream in the curriculum. More than 80% of respondents said they "might" or "would very much like" to do these things. Unlike the other two popular scenarios, these two do not represent traditionally sanctioned teaching or curricular ideas. Rather, they reflect recent trends and movements within education. The scenario on monitoring participation in class discussions represents the new consciousness that teachers should provide gender-equity in the classroom (American Association of University Women, 1995; Sadker & Sadker, 1994). The idea of including minority and "Third World" writers in the curriculum represents the impact of multicultural education movement. Much has been written in recent years about the importance of addressing issues of cultural diversity in education and educators' acceptance of the scenario on including "in the curriculum the writings, ideas, and accomplishments of women and men not considered part of the mainstream" represents the influence of that educational movement. What remains puzzling about these data is the support for a general scenario on multicultural education in contrast to the reluctance among a sizable group of respondents to examine sexist language or gender stereotypes in comic books. It is possible that people do not view gender issues as part of multicultural education. One Caucasian Christian elementary school teacher said he "might" include in a middle or high school curriculum the writings of men and women not considered part of the mainstream, but he was "not interested" in gender issues. The following comment he wrote on the questionnaire shows that he views some aspects of multiculturalism as unacceptable.

> Liberal agendas such as feminism and cultural diversity are destructive to our society and family structure and are inappropriate when teaching students to read and write.

Concluding remarks. One African American Baptist high school teacher who indicated that she "would very much like to do" all the teaching scenarios wrote that she had not "thought of focusing on gender issues in literacy education in this way." A Caucasian Protestant Christian reading specialist offered that the gender questions made her "think about gender issues in a different way." It seems possible that other respondents may have held similar views given that more than half of respondents indicated that they "might" or "would very much like to do" each teaching scenario. Worthy of further investigation are the reasons why some educators find some teaching scenarios more appealing than others.

Summary and Discussion

Summary

How and what do literacy professional know about student motivation, teacher research, library media specialist roles, book

clubs, portfolio assessment, home and school connections, and gender issues? And how do they come to know through reading professional literature, teacher education, teacher research, book clubs, and portfolio assessment? The following are key findings in answer to these questions:

- Literacy professionals read practitioner journal articles, books, and professional newspapers more often than research journals or electronic sources. Elementary school teachers often read magazines for generalists.
- Intrinsic indicators of motivation are more meaningful to literacy professionals than are extrinsic indicators.
- Literacy professionals believe that collaborative experiences between mentor teachers, student teachers, and teacher educators are important, but many of them have had little experience with such collaborations in student teaching programs.
- Many literacy professionals are familiar with teacher research, are interested in becoming teacher researchers, and find their practices influenced by teacher research.
- Literacy professionals find the roles of the library media specialist to be important; however, they place less importance on their work with parents and as consultants on planning, implementing, and assessing instruction and learning.
- Most literacy professionals agree that book clubs offer powerful tools to transform teaching, but most have not had such experiences for themselves and fewer still have had experiences with book clubs in which multicultural literature was read.
- A majority of literacy professionals have knowledge, experience, and interest in portfolio assessment, but they do not agree that portfolios should replace other forms of assessment.
- When considering literacy at home and school, most literacy professionals agree that literacy should be taught as an integral ingredient of everyday life, as a source of entertainment, and as a skill in this order of priority. Furthermore, they believe that at least half of the responsibility for educating children belongs to families.
- Most literacy professionals report moderate interest in gender issues and in instruction that focuses on gender issues in literacy and literature. Also, they believe that biological/physiological and social/cultural factors play equal roles in determining behavior.

Discussion

The purpose of conducting a national survey was to learn how literacy professionals' ways of knowing affect their practices. This broad aim was situated and limited by a second purpose, which was to investigate how literacy professionals from across the United States would respond to questionnaire items based on findings from a strand of highly contextualized qualitative studies on literacy professionals' ways of knowing sponsored by the National Reading Research Center. The intersection of

these two purposes was pursued through four types of questionnaire items:

- Interests (e.g., "How interested are you in becoming a teacher researcher?")
- Experiences (e.g., "How often do you use book clubs in your classroom?")
- Influences (e.g., "My practice has been influenced by reading about portfolio assessment.")
- Beliefs (e.g., Do you agree that literacy should be taught as a source of entertainment?")

Interests. Attention, concern, excitement, and curiosity are all words associated with being interested in something. Interest is perhaps what initiates seeking new knowledge. Thus, it seems significant that many literacy professionals expressed some degree of interest: (a) in using portfolio assessment, (b) in knowing about gender issues and engaging in teaching scenarios that focused on gender, (c) in using book clubs with children, (d) in becoming a teacher researcher, and (e) in belonging to a book club for adults. The interest expressed by literacy professionals in the areas surveyed suggests that they are relatively open-minded about new ideas. It may be a significant facet of literacy professionals' ways of knowing that they are curious and wanting to know more about whatever is currently being explored in education. A cynical interpretation would be that interest in portfolios, teacher research, gender issues, and book clubs is simply about wanting to be current or having a propensity to jump on the educational bandwagon. Whatever the motive, it still seems important that more educators want to know more about new ideas than would express no interest in those ideas. Of note is that interest is considerably greater for ideas that obviously relate to classroom pedagogy than for something like belonging to a book club for adults.

Experiences. Experience includes what we come to know or believe about the world by direct observation. One of the great epistemological debates is whether all knowledge is based on experience (Dretske, 1995a). Some philosophers distinguish experience from belief and knowledge while others propose that experience itself is belief-like in character. What seems less debatable is that experience is relevant to any discussion of knowing or epistemology. Thus, it is appropriate to consider what kind of experiences literacy professionals are having that might in turn be contributing to their process of knowing.

The information collected on experiences was limited to the foci of the National Reading Research studies that were used in creating the questionnaire items. Nevertheless, the results provide a portrait of the extent to which literacy professionals are engaging in experiences that contribute to knowing about contemporary topics in literacy education. There are some interesting contrasts in experience. Nearly three-fourths of literacy professionals report having some kind of experience with portfolio assessment. One-fourth report frequently participating in collaborations that involve a student teacher, classroom teacher, and university supervisor. One-fifth report having the experience of engaging in teacher research. Another interesting contrast is evident between literacy professionals' experience with adult book clubs versus their experience using book clubs with students. Fewer than one-fifth of

literacy professionals' are frequently reading about people from other cultures or discussing issues of cultural diversity in adult book clubs. Whereas more than one-third of literacy professionals report that this frequently occurs for their students in classroom book clubs. However, 67% report frequently selecting multicultural literature as part of an instructional theme or unit.

If experience is deemed an important aspect of knowing, then it seems important that literacy educators have ample opportunity to try or undergo new experiences. The survey results reveal a disparity between literacy professionals' interest and experience. While interest is high with regard to the areas surveyed, there apparently has been less experience with them. Perhaps more needs to be done to encourage and support literacy professionals to experience what they are interested in knowing more about.

Influences. To learn about literacy professionals' ways of knowing, certain questionnaire items sought information on whether particular experiences or actions had influenced their thinking about teaching or their teaching practices. It was presumed that finding out what literacy professionals report as influential would help identify more specifically the different means literacy professionals use to gain knowledge. The results indicate that one important influence is learning from other professionals' knowledge. One way of gaining knowledge from others is to read about or listen to what they have learned about literacy theory and practice. More than half of respondents agreed that reading or hearing about portfolio assessment and teacher research had been influential. It is puzzling that more literacy professionals agree that reading the professional literature has influenced their beliefs about literacy than agree that reading that literature has led to significant changes in their practices. This difference between beliefs and practices may have something to do with the disjuncture previously noted between interest and experience. Learning from others may be primarily influential with regard to becoming interested in and believing in the potential benefits of new teaching practices but less influential in getting people to learn from experiencing new ideas.

When experience does occur it also appears to be an important influence for literacy professionals. Respondents were much more likely to agree than disagree that their thinking or practice had been influenced by (a) three-way collaborative teacher education experiences, (b) experiences related to teacher research, and (c) experiences with portfolio assessment. A central feature within these experiences is the opportunity to work with other professionals. For example, supporting colleagues in their teacher research, supervising or mentoring new teachers, and participating in mentor/supervision support meetings were three different kinds of experience that at least half of the respondents agreed had influenced their thinking and practice. These findings support the conclusion that an important aspect of gaining knowledge that will affect practice involves having direct experience with new ideas and having opportunities to work closely with other adults.

Other potentially important influences are assuming new roles and responsibilites and focusing on one's own learning. Most respondents who had experience with being a teacher, co-teacher, or guest speaker in a university course agreed that it had influenced their practice. It is assumed that for the majority of respondents teaching at the university would be a new role and responsibility. Less clear are responses to items about one's own learning. Although the majority of respondents agreed that "getting in touch with beliefs that drive my practice" had been influential, the responses to other items on learning about oneself received mixed responses. Those who had experienced creating portfolios to document their learning and professional growth were divided with regard to whether that had influenced their practice. Again there seems to be a difference in the way literacy professionals view what can be learned from focusing on themselves as learners by creating portfolios, belonging to adult book clubs, and discussing issues of cultural diversity with other adults versus what can be learned from doing these things with students.

Beliefs. Belief is intimately related to knowledge. Philosophers generally think that "true belief is a necessary condition for knowledge" (Goldman, 1995, p. 447). Yet one cannot have beliefs without knowledge. Consider, for example, that holding beliefs about literacy requires knowing something about literacy as a concept or construct. The relationship of belief to knowledge is a central philosophical question. Belief in the philosophy of the mind is often taken to be the primary cognitive state. Other cognitive states of mind such as knowledge are taken to be a combination of belief with truth or justification (Dretske, 1995b). Attention to what literacy professionals believe, about different aspects of literacy education are therefore important to learning more about them as knowers.

In looking across those questionnaire items that sought information about what literacy professionals believe, one finds that there is considerable uniformity. Literacy professionals across the various occupational roles surveyed are more often than not in agreement with regard to: (a) valuing intrinsic indicators of a student's motivation for literacy more than extrinsic ones, (b) believing it is important that teacher preparation be a collaborative enterprise among the student teacher, mentor teacher, and university supervisor, (c) placing more importance on the traditional roles of library media specialists than on the expanded roles of instructional or parental consultant, (d) valuing book clubs for instruction and as a means for exploring cultural diversity, (e) seeing portfolio assessment as a means for documenting growth and process that informs instruction, and (f) giving home and school equal responsibility for educating children.

The consistencies present across questionnaire response options by occupational role in this random sample of U.S. literacy professionals is both surprising but interpretable. It is surprising to find such homogeneity in beliefs about matters related to literacy and education among respondents who are diverse with regard to years of employment in education, level of education, religious affiliation, and views of truth. On the other hand, a large majority of respondents are similar in that they

are female (86%), White/Caucasian/European American (87%), and support an eclectic approach that combines both basic skills and whole language (82%).

Understanding why so many literacy professionals hold similar beliefs may be related to understanding why "the basic grammar of schooling has remained remarkably stable over the decades" (Tyack & Tobin, 1994, p. 454). Historians of education have sought explanations for why schooling has remained so stable in the face of repeated reform movements (Cuban, 1984; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Tyack and Tobin observe that "reformers believe that their innovations will change schools, but it is important to recognize that schools change reforms" (p. 478). Typically, educational reforms have to accommodate entrenched patterns of schooling (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Perhaps the same complex of economic, political, and social forces that work to maintain the norms of schooling across time also account in similar ways for literacy educators having similar beliefs. Non-individualist philosophers hold that belief is in part determined by the believer's environment (Dretske, 1995b). Given this perspective on belief, the structures and rules that make up the grammar of schooling would play an important role in the content of literacy professionals' beliefs. The continuity of that grammar would be likely to result in some continuity in teacher beliefs. Shared beliefs among educators, according to Tyack and Tobin (1994), "could energize a broad social movement to remake the schools" (p. 478).

Although the previous explanation is plausible, it is also prudent to consider that what appears to be similar may not be. The survey questionnaire assumes, to a large extent, shared meaning with regard to ideas such as collaboration in teacher education, portfolio assessment, book clubs on cultural diversity, and so forth. These ideas fall within the realm of educational reform. Therefore, it is prudent to wonder whether there is much consistency across the meanings literacy professionals have in mind, particularly in light of the history of educational reforms being altered and adjusted so that they conform to the grammar of schooling. Obviously, caution must be taken in drawing conclusions about the finding that literacy professionals' beliefs were more alike than different.

References

Alexander, P., Jetton, T. L., & Kulikowich, J. M. (1995). Interrelationship of knowledge, interest, and recall: Assessing a model of domain learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*, 559–75.

Allen, J., & Shockley, B. (1996). Composing a research dialogue: University and school research communities encountering a cultural shift. *Reading Research Quarterly, 31*, 220–228.

Alvermann, D. E. (1990). Reading teacher education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 687–704). New York: Macmillan.

Alvermann, D. E. (1996). Introducing feminist perspectives in a content literacy course: Struggles and self-contradictions. In D. J. Leu, C. K. Kinzer, & K. A. Hinchman (Eds.), *Literacies for the 21st century: Research and practice* (pp. 124–133). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

Alvermann, D. E., & Commeyras, M. (1994). *Gender, text, and discussion: Expanding the possibilities* (Perspective No. 3). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland.

Alvermann, D. E., Commeyras, M., Young, J., Randall, S., & Hinson, D. (1996). *Interrupting gendered discursive practices in classroom talk about texts: Easy to think about, difficult to do* (Research Report No. 54). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

American Association of University Women (1995). *How schools shortchange girls*. New York: Marlowe & Co.

Au, K. H., & Mason, J. M. (1981). Social organizational factors in learning to read: The balance of rights hypothesis. *Reading Research Quarterly, 17*, 115–152.

Austin, M. C., & Morrison, C. (1963). *The first R*. New York: Macmillan.

Baker, L., Sonnenschein, S., Serpell, R., Fernandez-Fein, S., & Scher, D. (1994). *Contexts of emergent literacy: Everyday home experiences of urban pre-kindergarten children* (Research Report No. 24). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Baumann, J. F. (1995). Sabbatical in second grade: Reflecting on the lived experience. In C. K. Kinzer, K. Hinchman, & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy research and practice: Forty-fourth yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 390–399). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Baumann, J. F. (1996). Conflict or compatibility in classroom inquiry? One teacher's struggle to balance teaching and research. *Educational Researcher, 25*, 29–36.

Baumann, J. F., Allen, J., & Shockley, B. (1994). *Research questions teachers ask: A report from the National Reading Research Center School Research Consortium* (Reading Report No. 30). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Baumann, J. F., & Heubach, K. M. (1994). *Do basal readers deskill teachers?* (Reading Research Report No. 26). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Baumann, J. F., Shockley, B., & Allen, J. (1996). *Methodology in teacher research: Three cases* (Perspective No. 10). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Baumann, N., Fuentes, C., & Holman, J. (1996). *Reading challenge: The transition from picture books to chapter books* (Instructional Resource No. 37). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Britzman, D. (1991). *Student makes student: A critical study of learning to teach*. New York: SUNY Press.

Brown, R. (1991). The one-literacy schoolhouse in the age of multiple literacies. *Educational Horizons, 69*, 141–145.

Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 291–310). New York: Macmillan.

Casanova, U. (1996). Parent involvement: A call for prudence. *Educational Researcher, 25*(8), 30–32.

Clift, R. T., & Say, M. (1998). Teacher education: Collaboration or conflict? *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(3), 2–7.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1993). *Inside outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1987). Families and schools. *Educational Researcher, 16*(6), 32–38.

Commeyras, M., Osborn, J., & Bruce, B. (1992). The reactions of educators to the Framework for the 1992 NAEP for Reading. In C. K. Kinzer

& D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Literacy research, theory, and practice: Views from many perspectives* (Forty-First Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, pp. 137–152). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

Commeyras, M., Osborn, J., & Bruce, B. (1994). What do classroom teachers think about the 1992 NAEP in reading? *Reading Research and Instruction, 34*, 5–18.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cuban, L. (1984). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms: 1890–1980*. New York: Longman.

Cunningham, P. M. (1991). Research directions: Multimethod, multilevel literacy instruction in first grade. *Language Arts, 68*, 578–584.

Dales, B. (1990). Trusting relations between teachers and librarians. *Language Arts, 67*, 732–734.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Ancess, J. (1993). Authentic assessment and teachers' professional development. Resources for restructuring: Newsletter for *Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching*, 1–6.

Deci, E. L. (1992). The relation of interest to the motivation of behavior: A self-determination theory perspective. In K. A. Renninger, S. Hidi, & A. Krapp (Eds.), *The role of interest in learning and development* (pp. 43–70). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

DeGroff, L. (1996). *Perceptions of roles and relationships in the school library: A national survey of teachers, administrators and library-media specialists* (Research Report No. 72). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press.

Dillman, D. A. (1983). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York: Wiley.

Dretske, F. (1995a). Experience. In T. Honderich (Ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (261). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dretske, F. (1995b). Belief. In T. Honderich (Ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (82–83). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elbaz, F. L. (1983). *Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge*. London: Croom Helm.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 20, pp. 3–56). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Finders, Margaret (1996). *Just girls*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Flood, J., & Lapp, D. (1994). Teacher book clubs: Establishing literature discussion groups for teachers. *The Reading Teacher, 47*, 574–576.

Flood, J., Lapp, D., Alvarez, D., Romero, A., Ranck-Buhr, W., Moore, J., Kabildis, C., & Lungren, L. (1994). *Teacher books clubs: A study of teachers' and student teachers' participation in contemporary multicultural fiction literature discussion groups* (Research Report No. 22). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Goatley, V. J., Brock, C. H., & Raphael, T. E. (1995). Diverse learners participating in regular education "Book Clubs." *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*, 352–380.

Goldman, A. (1995). Knowledge. In T. Honderich (Ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (447–48). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goodman, K. (1986). *What's whole in whole language*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Graham, P., & Hudson-Ross. S. (1996). *Teacher candidate research on literacy in high school classrooms* (Instructional Resource No. 19). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Hankins, K. (in press). One moment in two times. *Teacher Research.*

Harrington, H. (1994). Teaching and knowing. *Journal of Teacher Education, 45*, 190–198.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hoffman, J. V., & Kugle, C. (1982). A study of theoretical orientation to reading and its relationship to teacher verbal feedback during reading instruction. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 18*, 2–7.

Hollingsworth, S. (1994). *Teacher research and urban literacy education: Lessons and conversations in a feminist key.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Huberman, M. (1996). Moving mainstream: Taking a closer look at teacher research. *Language Arts, 73*, 124–140.

Hudson-Ross, S., & Graham, P. (1996). *Complexities of a collaborative inquiry community: Mentor teachers' growth within a high school English teacher education program* (Research Report No. 70). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Hudson-Ross, S., & McWhorter, P. (1996). *Findings from a yearlong job exchange: A mentor-teacher's bill of rights in teacher education* (Reading Research Report No. 74). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland.

Hudson-Ross, S., McWhorter, P., & Moore, C. P. (1994, April). *The synergy project: Teacher and teacher educator exchanging roles to expand research relationships and knowledge.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Johns, J. L., & Van Leirsburg, P. (1992). How professionals view portfolio assessment. *Reading Research and Instruction, 32*, 1–10.

Johnston, R. C. (1996, March). Riley calls for fresh fight on illiteracy. *Education Week, 15*, p. 29.

Johnston, S. (1994). Experience is the best teacher; Or is it? An analysis of the role of experience in learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education, 45*, 199–208.

Jongsma, K. S. (1991). Critical literacy. *The Reading Teacher, 44*, 518–519.

Kalton, G. (1983). Introduction to survey sampling. *Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07–035.* Beverly Hills and London: Sage.

Kamil, M. L. (1995). Some alternatives to paradigm wars in literacy research. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 27*, 243–261.

Keffer, A., Carr, S., Lanier, B., Mattison, L., Wood, D., & Stanulis, R. (1995). Teacher-researchers discover magic in forming an adult writing workshop. *Language Arts, 73*, 113–121.

Kieffer, R. D., & Faust, M. A. (1994). Portfolio process and teacher change: Elementary, middle, and secondary teachers reflect on their initial experiences with portfolio evaluation. In C. K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Multidimensional aspects of literacy research, theory, and practice* (pp. 82–88). Chicago, IL: Forty-third National Reading Conference Yearbook.

Kieffer, R. D., Faust, M. A., Morrison, L. S., & Hilderbrand, C. (1996a). *A year long study of portfolio process* (unpublished Research Report). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Kieffer, R. D., & Faust, M. A., Morrison, L. S., & Hilderbrand, C. (1996b). *Questions about portfolio process* (Instructional Resource No. 28). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Kieffer, R. D., & Morrison, L. S. (1994). Changing portfolio process: One journey toward authentic assessment. *Language Arts, 71*, 411–418.

Kozol, J. (1985). *Illiterate America.* Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Information Power: Guidelines for school library media programs. (1988). Chicago: American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

Lanier, J., & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. (3rd ed.) (pp. 527–569). New York: McMillan.

MacGillivray, L., & King, J. R. (1995). Inside/out: Talking and questioning our teaching selves through e-mail exchanges. In K. A. Hinchman, D. J. Leu, & C. K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy research and practice—Forty-fourth yearbook of the National Reading Conference*. (pp. 407–416). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

McKenna, M. C., Kear, D. J., & Ellsworth, R. A. (1995). Children's attitudes toward reading: A national survey. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*, 934–956.

McKenna, M. C., Stahl, S. A., & Reinking, D. (1994). A critical commentary on research, politics, and whole language. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 26*, 211–233.

McMahon, S. I. (1992). *A group of five students as they participate in their student-led book club*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

McMahon, S. I., Raphael, T. E., & Goatley, V. J. (1995). Changing the context for classroom reading instruction: The Book Club Project for urban students. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching* (Vol. V, pp. 123–166). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

McWhorter, P., Jarrad, B., Lee, S., Rhoades, M., & Wiltcher, B. (1996). *Student-generated curriculum lessons from our students* (Instructional Resource No. 30). Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

National Education Association (NEA). (1988). *Conditions and resources of teaching*. Washington, DC: NEA Research Division.

O'Flahavan, J., Gambrell, L. B., Guthrie, J., Stahl, S., Baumann, J. F., & Alvermann, D. E. (1992, August/September). Poll results guide activities of research center. *Reading Today*, p. 12.

Oldfather, P. (1991). Students' perceptions of their own reasons/purposes for being or not being involved in learning activities: A qualitative study of student motivation (Doctoral dissertation, The Claremont Graduate School, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52*, 853A.

Oldfather, P. (1993). What students say about motivating experiences in a whole language classroom. *The Reading Teacher, 46*, 672–681.

Oldfather, P. (1994). *When students do not feel motivated for literacy learning: How a responsive classroom culture helps* (Reading Research Report No. 8). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Oldfather. P., & Dahl, K. (1994). Toward a social constructivist reconceptualization of intrinsic motivation for literacy learning. *Journal of Reading Behavior: A Journal of Literacy, 26*, 139–158.

Oldfather, P., & McLaughlin, J. (1993). Gaining and losing voice: A longitudinal study of students' continuing impulse to learn across elementary and middle school contexts. *Research in Middle Level Education, 17*, 1–25.

Orellana, M. F. (1995). Literacy as a gendered social practice: Tasks, talk, texts, and take-up. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*, 674–709.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 307–332.

Patterson, L. A., Stansell, J. C., & Lee, S. C. (1990). *Teacher research: From promise to power*. Katonah, NY: Richard C. Owen.

Pintrich, P. R. (1990). Implications of psychological research on student learning and college teaching for teacher education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 826–857). New York: Macmillan.

Raphael, T. E., & McMahon, S. I. (1994). "Book Club": An alternative framework for reading instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 48*, 102–116.

Renninger, K. A., Hidi, S., & Krapp, A. (1992). *The role of interest in learning and development*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rice, J. M. (1893). *The public school system of the United States*. New York: Century.

Richardson, V. (1994). Conducting research on practice. *Educational Researcher, 23*(5), 5–10.

Richardson, V., Anders, P., Tidwell, D., & Lloyd, C. (1991). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in reading comprehension instruction. *American Educational Research Journal, 28*, 559–586.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How America's schools cheat girls*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Santa, C. M., & Santa, J. L. (1995). Teacher as researcher. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 27*, 439–451.

Schommer, M. (1994). Synthesizing epistemological belief research: Tentative understandings and provocative confusions. *Educational Psychology Review, 6*, 293–319.

Scott, J. W. (1992). "Experience." In J. Butler & J. W. Scott, *Feminists theorize the political* (pp. 22–40). New York: Routledge.

Seidel, J. V. (1988). *The ethnograph* (version 3.0) [computer program]. Littleton, CO: Qualis Research Associates.

Serpell, R., Baker, L., & Sonnenschein, S. (1995). *Home and school contexts of emergent literacy* (Instructional Resource No. 18). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*, 1–22.

Smylie, M. A. (1989). Teachers' views of the effectiveness of sources of learning to teach. *Elementary School Journal, 89*, 543–558.

Sonnenschein, S., Baker, L., & Serpell, R. (1995). *Documenting the child's everyday home experiences: The ecological inventory as a resource for teachers* (Instructional Resource No. 11). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Sonnenschein, S., Baker, L., Serpell, R., Scher, D., Fernandez-Fein, S., & Munsterman, K. A. (1996). *Strands of emergent literacy and their antecedents in the home: Urban preschoolers' early literacy development* (Research Report No. 48). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Templeton, S. (1990). New trends in an historical perspective: Children's librarians and language arts educators. *Language Arts, 67*, 776–779.

Tharp, R. G. (1989). Psychocultural variables and constants: Effects on teaching and learning. *American Psychologist, 44*, 349–359.

Thimmesch, N. (Ed.). (1984). *Aliteracy, people who can read but won't*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.

Thomas, S., & Oldfather, P. (1996). *Enhancing student and teacher engagement in literacy learning: A shared inquiry approach* (Instructional Resource No. 17). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Tobias, S. (1994). Interest, prior knowledge, and learning. *Review of Educational Research, 64*(1), 37–54.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D., & Tobin, W. (1994). The "grammar" of schooling: Why has it been so hard to change? *American Educational Research Journal, 31*, 453–479.

University of Georgia, & University of Maryland (1991, October). *National Reading Research Center: A proposal from the University of Georgia and the University of Maryland*. Athens, GA, & College Park MD: University of Georgia and University of Maryland.

Valencia, S. (1990). A portfolio approach to classroom reading assessment: The whys, whats, and hows. *The Reading Teacher, 43*, 338–340.

Valencia, S. V., Hiebert, E. H., & Afflerbach, P. P. (Eds.). (1994). *Authentic reading assessment*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Venezky, R. L. (1984) The history of reading research. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 1, pp. 3–38). New York: Longman.

Weaver, D., & Stanulis, R. (1996). *Teacher as mentor, teacher as learner: Mentoring a first-year teacher in middle school language arts* (Instructional Resource No. 32). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Weaver, C. (1988). *Reading process and practice: From socio-psycholinguistics to whole language*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Wilson, S. M. (1995). Not tension but intention: A response to Wong's analysis of the researcher/teacher. *Educational Researcher, 24*(8), 19–23.

Wolf, K., & Siu-Runyan, Y. (1996). Portfolio purposes and possibilities. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 40*, 30–37.

Wong, E. D. (1995a). Challenges confronting the researcher/teacher: Conflicts of purpose and conduct. *Educational Researcher, 24*(3), 22–28.

Wong, E. D. (1995b). Challenges confronting the researcher/teacher: A rejoinder to Wilson. *Educational Researcher, 24*(8), 22–23.

Worthen, B. R. (1993). Critical issues that will determine the future of alternative assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74*, 444–454.

Appendix

Table 1. Questionnaires Sent and Received

		TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Sent		900	900	600	300	600	600	600	600	5100
Received	(n)	264	250	221	119	98	107	216	207	1482
	(%)	29.33	27.78	36.83	39.67	16.33	17.83	36.00	34.50	29.06
Current position unreported										37
Total Received										1519

Table 2. Respondent Demographics

	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Gender									
Female (n)	259	219	192	93	49	95	193	161	1261
(%)	98.85	88.66	87.27	79.49	51.04	91.35	90.19	78.54	86.08
Male (n)	3	28	28	24	47	9	21	44	204
(%)	1.15	11.34	12.73	20.51	48.96	8.65	9.81	21.46	13.92
Highest Degree									
Bachelors	55.38	45.93	36.53	31.90	1.05	7.92	18.84	0.97	29.22
Masters	42.31	48.37	56.16	60.34	55.79	49.50	66.18	15.46	47.83
Specialist	2.31	3.66	7.31	5.17	28.42	38.61	14.01	4.83	9.79
Doctorate	0.00	2.03	0.00	2.59	14.74	3.96	0.97	78.74	13.16
Beliefs and Practices									
I support skills and back-to-basics	12.70	14.57	15.42	5.13	11.58	2.83	12.62	2.55	10.61
I support an eclectic approach that combines both basic skills and whole language	81.35	83.81	80.37	90.60	80.00	90.57	83.98	73.47	82.27
I support whole language beliefs and practices	5.95	1.62	4.21	4.27	8.42	6.60	3.40	23.98	7.12

Table 2. Respondent Demographics (con't)

		TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Researchers can ultimately get to the truth										
Strongly disagree	1	5.88	7.35	6.22	6.09	3.09	5.15	4.39	14.80	6.98
	2	35.69	40.41	37.32	27.83	29.90	35.05	34.15	18.37	33.05
	3	54.51	47.76	53.59	60.87	61.86	55.67	55.61	61.22	55.39
Strongly agree	4	3.92	4.49	2.87	5.22	5.15	4.12	5.85	5.61	4.58
Truth is unchanging										
Strongly disagree	1	21.32	22.22	22.54	28.07	17.71	29.00	18.75	41.09	24.90
	2	38.37	40.33	37.56	33.33	39.58	38.00	44.23	32.18	38.21
	3	29.07	25.51	29.11	27.19	26.04	20.00	25.96	14.85	25.03
Strongly agree	4	11.24	11.93	10.80	11.40	16.67	13.00	11.06	11.88	11.85

Table 3. Reading Professional Literature

Within the past year, how often have you read any of the following:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Books about literacy teaching or learning									
Never	11.41	13.25	17.27	11.86	8.25	3.81	19.91	1.95	11.78
1-5 times	53.23	54.62	54.09	53.39	56.70	43.81	58.29	17.56	48.91
6-10 times	22.81	18.07	17.27	20.34	18.56	24.76	9.00	28.29	19.62
11 or more times	12.55	14.06	11.36	14.41	16.49	27.62	12.80	52.20	19.69
Practitioner journals (such as English Education, Language Arts, The Reading Teacher, School Library Journal, Educational Leadership)									
Never	22.43	20.97	13.76	9.24	4.08	6.54	3.26	1.96	11.82
1-5 times	46.01	43.95	40.83	36.97	27.55	22.43	23.26	11.27	33.08
6-10 times	22.05	20.97	29.36	25.21	29.59	31.78	24.65	16.18	23.98
11 or more times	9.51	14.11	16.06	28.57	38.78	39.25	48.84	70.59	31.11

Table 3. Reading Professional Literature (con't)

Within the past year, how often have you read any of the following:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Magazines (such as Instructor, Mailbox, Teaching K-8)									
Never	4.96	5.62	12.33	33.33	16.67	16.35	18.10	18.91	13.85
1-5 times	21.37	22.09	36.07	39.32	42.71	43.27	36.19	39.80	32.78
6-10 times	27.86	32.53	30.14	19.66	20.83	24.04	19.05	20.90	25.38
11 or more times	45.80	39.76	21.46	7.69	19.79	16.35	26.67	20.40	27.98
Newspapers (such as Reading Today, NCTE Council Chronicles)									
Never	40.70	32.10	31.48	18.97	28.87	13.21	42.31	7.43	28.91
1-5 times	39.92	39.92	37.50	35.34	26.80	41.51	37.50	27.72	36.38
6-10 times	10.85	18.11	23.61	28.45	19.59	30.19	13.94	32.18	20.82
11 or more times	8.53	9.88	7.41	17.24	24.74	15.09	6.25	32.67	13.90

Table 3. Reading Professional Literature (con't)

Within the past year, how often have you read any of the following:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Research journals (such as Reading Research Quarterly, Research in the Teaching of English)									
Never	64.34	55.24	50.93	43.48	35.79	36.45	56.40	7.35	46.08
1-5 times	28.68	33.87	37.50	40.00	36.84	42.06	32.70	36.27	34.94
6-10 times	6.59	7.26	8.33	10.43	18.95	15.89	7.58	23.53	11.28
11 or more times	0.39	3.63	3.24	6.09	8.42	5.61	3.32	32.84	7.70
Electronic sources of information (Internet, CD-ROM, Databases)									
Never	66.28	54.66	51.58	43.10	41.24	64.49	17.54	29.90	46.38
1-5 times	23.75	27.53	30.77	38.79	29.90	19.63	26.54	31.86	28.28
6-10 times	4.21	8.10	10.41	7.76	13.40	6.54	13.74	12.25	9.36
11 or more times	5.75	9.72	7.24	10.34	15.46	9.35	42.18	25.98	15.98

Table 3. Reading Professional Literature (con't)

	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Reading the professional literature has influenced my beliefs about literacy									
Strongly disagree	2.33	4.86	4.67	1.72	3.13	0.00	3.33	0.49	2.82
Disagree	17.83	15.79	19.63	23.28	11.46	10.28	16.19	5.83	15.27
Agree	66.67	70.45	64.95	61.21	57.29	61.68	66.67	47.57	62.93
Strongly agree	13.18	8.91	10.75	13.79	28.13	28.04	13.81	46.12	18.98
Reading the professional literature has led to signficant changes in my practice									
Strongly disagree	1.97	4.92	4.69	1.72	3.09	0.00	4.33	2.93	3.25
Disagree	31.50	29.51	31.46	31.90	22.68	21.50	32.21	10.73	27.01
Agree	54.33	57.79	52.58	56.90	55.67	53.27	54.33	44.39	53.46
Strongly agree	12.20	7.79	11.27	9.48	18.56	25.23	9.13	41.95	16.27
Are you a meember of a professional literacy association (IRA, NCTE, ALA)?									
Yes	18.99	22.22	29.44	53.45	26.04	81.90	54.29	87.94	43.58
No	81.01	77.78	70.56	46.55	73.96	18.10	45.71	12.06	56.42

Table 4. Motivation Indicators

To what extent do you find the following to be meaningful indicators of a student's motivation for literacy learning?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Achieves high test scores and good grades									
Not meaningful	7.28	2.81	1.83	1.68	3.06	1.87	2.79	3.43	3.40
Somewhat meaningful	31.80	24.50	29.22	20.17	23.47	37.38	20.00	38.24	28.26
Meaningful	44.06	50.20	42.92	54.62	54.08	41.12	46.05	42.16	46.26
Very meaningful	16.86	22.49	26.03	23.53	19.39	19.63	31.16	16.18	22.08
Initiates or suggests ideas for class projects									
Not meaningful	0.38	0.80	2.74	5.04	3.06	0.93	2.83	1.96	1.97
Somewhat meaningful	15.59	14.06	15.53	17.65	21.43	12.15	16.98	13.73	15.57
Meaningful	46.39	50.20	55.25	43.70	41.84	46.73	56.13	44.61	49.01
Very meaningful	37.64	34.94	26.48	33.61	33.67	40.19	24.06	39.71	33.45

Table 4. Motivation Indicators (con't)

To what extent do you find the following to be meaningful indicators of a student's motivation for literacy learning?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Chooses to read/write on their own beyond class requirements									
Not meaningful	0.38	0.80	2.27	3.39	2.04	1.87	1.88	1.47	1.56
Somewhat meaningful	5.32	5.22	7.27	9.32	9.18	5.61	7.04	5.39	6.45
Meaningful	22.43	22.09	25.00	17.80	28.57	17.76	27.23	13.73	21.94
Very meaningful	71.86	71.89	65.45	69.49	60.20	74.77	63.85	79.41	70.04
Participates regularly in class assignments and activities									
Not meaningful	0.00	0.40	0.00	1.68	1.02	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.41
Somewhat meaningful	9.09	9.27	10.91	7.56	18.37	13.08	15.57	17.65	12.30
Meaningful	54.92	48.79	55.45	56.30	50.00	44.86	51.89	48.53	51.70
Very meaningful	35.98	41.53	33.64	34.45	30.61	42.06	31.60	33.82	35.60

Table 4. Motivation Indicators (con't)

To what extent do you find the following to be meaningful indicators of a student's motivation for literacy learning?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Meets teacher's standards for high quality work									
Not meaningful	0.38	0.80	0.91	1.68	1.02	0.00	2.36	4.43	1.49
Somewhat meaningful	15.15	17.27	15.45	11.76	18.37	27.10	18.40	23.15	17.93
Meaningful	58.33	44.58	56.36	52.10	51.02	40.19	47.17	45.32	50.00
Very meaningful	26.14	37.35	27.27	34.45	29.59	32.71	32.08	27.09	30.57
Applies principles of critical thinking to literacy activity									
Not meaningful	0.76	1.21	1.36	3.36	0.00	0.93	2.35	0.98	1.36
Somewhat meaningful	9.89	8.87	10.45	8.40	13.27	7.48	10.33	6.34	9.30
Meaningful	40.68	32.66	41.36	28.57	32.65	33.64	38.03	25.37	34.89
Very meaningful	48.67	57.26	46.82	59.66	54.08	57.94	49.30	67.32	54.45

Table 4. Motivation Indicators (con't)

To what extent do you find the following to be meaningful indicators of a student's motivation for literacy learning?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Initiates reflective self-assessment									
Not meaningful	3.05	2.02	3.18	3.36	1.02	5.61	5.63	1.47	3.13
Somewhat meaningful	15.27	14.57	14.55	14.49	10.20	9.35	17.84	7.35	13.47
Meaningful	43.51	34.82	36.36	28.57	37.76	28.04	38.97	25.00	35.03
Very meaningful	38.17	48.58	45.91	53.78	51.02	57.01	37.56	66.18	48.37
Challenges an author's authority									
Not meaningful	10.34	8.87	12.27	5.93	7.22	5.61	12.32	2.94	8.73
Somewhat meaningful	29.50	28.23	22.73	27.12	19.59	22.43	25.59	14.22	24.22
Meaningful	37.55	31.85	36.82	27.12	39.18	42.06	36.49	38.73	36.08
Very meaningful	22.61	31.05	28.18	39.83	34.02	29.91	25.59	44.12	30.97

Table 5. Collaborations in Student Teaching

	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
How often have you been involved in a three-way collaboration that involved a student teacher, classroom teacher, and university supervisor?									
Never	27.38	26.64	33.94	26.89	18.56	39.42	48.13	9.27	28.96
Seldom	48.29	50.41	50.92	53.78	47.42	48.08	46.26	25.85	45.97
Frequently	24.33	22.95	15.14	19.33	34.02	12.50	5.61	64.88	25.07
To what degree do you <u>believe</u> such a collaboration between student teacher, classroom teacher, and university supervisor, is an important part of student teaching?									
Unimportant	0.00	2.06	0.46	1.69	1.05	0.00	1.89	0.98	1.03
Somewhat important	8.46	11.11	12.39	17.80	7.37	6.60	12.74	3.41	9.95
Important	33.85	29.63	38.99	43.22	33.68	43.40	42.92	21.46	34.93
Very important	57.69	57.20	48.17	37.29	57.89	50.00	42.45	74.15	54.08

Table 6. Teacher Education and Influences on Practice

My own practice has been influenced by ...	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Being a teacher/co-teacher/ guest speaker in university courses									
Strongly disagree	5.86	7.79	7.94	8.55	4.21	4.90	10.29	0.49	6.41
Disagree	8.20	7.38	8.88	12.82	16.84	11.76	7.35	2.96	8.50
Agree	19.53	22.13	19.63	21.37	32.63	16.67	16.18	23.15	20.84
Strongly Agree	13.28	17.62	15.89	23.93	29.47	20.59	11.27	65.02	23.90
Not applicable	53.13	45.08	47.66	33.33	16.84	46.08	54.90	8.37	40.35
Supervising/mentoring novice teachers									
Strongly disagree	1.56	3.70	4.72	3.39	0.00	3.92	6.80	1.46	3.33
Disagree	7.78	5.35	7.55	8.47	9.28	11.76	8.25	4.39	7.36
Agree	38.13	33.33	33.49	38.14	29.90	25.49	26.70	24.88	31.67
Strongly agree	27.24	30.45	24.53	28.81	56.70	28.43	12.14	60.00	32.08
Not applicable	25.29	27.16	29.72	21.19	4.12	30.39	46.12	9.27	25.56

Table 6. Teacher Education and Influences on Practice (con't)

My own practice has been influenced by ...	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Being a participant in mentor/supervision support meetings									
Strongly disagree	1.94	4.55	5.61	2.56	1.04	2.91	7.28	2.48	3.82
Disagree	6.59	7.02	9.81	12.82	6.25	12.62	8.25	8.42	8.55
Agree	36.05	35.95	28.97	39.32	38.54	34.95	26.21	30.20	33.10
Strongly agree	18.99	20.25	20.56	16.24	41.67	20.39	14.56	40.59	23.23
Not applicable	36.43	32.23	35.05	29.06	12.50	29.13	43.69	18.32	31.29
Getting in touch with beliefs that drive my practice									
Strongly disagree	0.77	2.07	3.29	0.00	0.00	0.96	1.48	1.50	1.46
Disagree	2.30	1.65	2.35	3.39	5.21	0.96	4.93	2.50	2.78
Agree	42.91	37.19	40.85	41.53	35.42	28.85	41.87	27.00	37.65
Strongly agree	49.04	52.89	45.54	50.00	54.17	64.42	41.87	63.00	51.64
Not applicable	4.98	6.20	7.89	5.08	5.21	4.81	9.85	6.00	6.47

Table 7. Familiarity with Teacher Research

What is your familiarity with teacher research?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Not familiar	33.08	30.89	30.59	22.88	12.50	17.92	31.16	1.95	24.46
Somewhat familiar	44.87	40.24	44.29	44.92	29.17	37.74	40.00	14.15	37.47
Familiar	16.73	21.95	20.55	26.27	33.33	31.13	25.12	36.10	25.00
Very familiar	5.32	6.91	4.57	5.93	25.00	13.21	3.72	47.80	13.08

Table 8. Interest in Becoming a Teacher Researcher

How interested are you in becoming a teacher researcher?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Not at all interested	34.23	32.93	29.77	20.18	22.92	19.05	34.27	3.90	26.13
Somewhat interested	40.38	35.77	40.00	48.25	26.04	42.86	31.46	11.22	33.98
Very interested	13.85	14.23	15.81	17.54	17.71	16.19	13.62	15.61	15.13
I already consider myself to be a teacher researcher	9.23	13.82	11.63	12.28	20.83	18.10	12.68	60.49	19.74
Not applicable	2.31	3.25	2.79	1.75	12.50	3.81	7.98	8.78	5.02

Table 9. Influences of Teacher Research on Teaching

My thinking about teaching has been strongly influenced by:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Reading teacher research									
Strongly disagree	3.45	6.15	5.56	5.93	2.11	2.88	7.32	0.50	4.43
Disagree	17.62	19.26	18.52	22.03	11.58	12.50	13.17	6.93	15.50
Agree	53.26	50.41	45.83	49.15	47.37	49.04	47.32	39.60	47.89
Strongly agree	13.03	13.52	14.81	11.86	31.58	26.92	14.15	50.00	20.83
Not applicable	12.64	10.66	15.28	11.02	7.37	8.65	18.05	2.97	11.35
Hearing teachers talk about their research									
Strongly disagree	3.08	4.90	5.53	4.27	2.08	2.88	6.19	1.48	3.99
Disagree	13.85	13.47	17.05	17.95	18.75	11.54	13.33	13.30	14.60
Agree	50.77	41.63	41.47	47.01	40.63	50.00	41.43	44.33	44.56
Strongly agree	18.46	24.49	19.35	14.53	27.08	22.12	17.14	35.96	22.38
Not applicable	13.85	15.51	16.59	16.24	11.46	13.46	21.90	4.93	14.46

Table 9. Influences of Teacher Research on Teaching (con't)

My thinking about teaching has been strongly influenced by:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Participating in teacher research projects									
Strongly disagree	5.84	7.82	5.96	6.03	3.13	7.77	6.80	0.50	5.55
Disagree	19.46	15.23	17.43	23.28	18.75	15.53	16.50	7.43	16.31
Agree	22.18	26.34	30.73	27.59	28.13	27.18	29.13	33.66	27.97
Strongly agree	10.12	11.93	12.39	7.76	23.96	18.45	10.68	48.02	17.49
Not applicable	42.41	38.68	33.49	35.34	26.04	31.07	36.89	10.40	32.69
Supporting colleagues in their teacher research									
Strongly disagree	5.04	6.17	5.09	5.17	3.13	4.90	6.37	0.00	4.59
Disagree	15.89	15.23	13.43	16.38	10.42	15.69	10.29	8.42	13.22
Agree	32.56	30.45	36.57	36.21	38.54	29.41	35.29	45.05	35.42
Strongly agree	9.69	12.35	11.11	10.34	31.25	17.65	13.73	35.64	16.63
Not applicable	36.82	35.80	33.80	31.90	16.67	32.35	34.31	10.89	30.13

Table 9. Influences of Teacher Research on Teaching (con't)

My thinking about teaching has been strongly influenced by:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Writing reports of teacher research									
Strongly disagree	8.91	9.09	8.29	12.07	4.21	4.95	10.78	1.97	7.80
Disagree	25.97	21.07	26.73	22.41	30.53	21.78	18.14	15.76	22.42
Agree	13.57	20.66	15.67	18.10	26.32	25.74	22.06	38.42	21.87
Strongly agree	2.71	4.96	5.99	5.17	12.63	9.90	1.96	29.06	8.57
Not applicable	48.84	44.21	43.32	42.24	26.32	37.62	47.06	14.78	39.35
Presenting teacher research at conferences or at your school									
Strongly disagree	7.34	9.05	7.41	12.07	6.25	6.80	10.73	1.49	7.57
Disagree	20.08	14.40	16.67	16.38	16.67	15.53	14.63	10.89	15.69
Agree	15.83	23.87	19.91	21.55	22.92	21.36	20.49	33.66	22.29
Strongly agree	6.18	11.11	12.04	8.62	32.29	20.39	6.83	39.11	15.56
Not applicable	50.58	41.56	43.98	41.38	21.88	35.92	47.32	14.85	38.89

Table 10. Library-Media Specialist Roles

How important is it that the ...	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
LMS provides access to the library media center									
Unimportant	0.00	0.41	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50	0.41
Somewhat important	1.15	2.06	2.75	1.68	0.00	4.72	0.47	3.50	1.99
Important	27.31	18.52	18.35	19.33	29.90	16.98	8.92	26.50	20.47
Very important	71.54	79.01	77.98	78.99	70.10	78.30	90.61	68.50	77.13
LMS provides assistance in locating information									
Unimportant	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07
Somewhat important	0.77	2.87	3.67	0.84	2.06	2.88	1.40	5.50	2.54
Important	26.05	20.08	19.72	21.85	29.90	22.12	10.70	28.50	21.81
Very important	73.18	76.64	76.61	77.31	68.04	75.00	87.91	66.00	75.58

Table 10. Library-Media Specialist Roles (con't)

How important is it that the ...	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
LMS teaches so that students are effective producers and consumers of information									
Unimportant	0.00	1.65	0.46	0.84	0.00	0.00	0.47	1.00	0.62
Somewhat important	4.60	4.55	5.96	4.20	1.03	3.85	1.40	6.97	4.32
Important	30.27	26.03	26.61	28.57	29.90	25.96	13.49	24.88	25.33
Very important	65.13	67.77	66.97	66.39	69.07	70.19	84.65	67.16	69.73
LMS instructs or consults with teachers and administrators									
Unimportant	0.77	0.83	0.46	1.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.55
Somewhat important	8.46	7.44	5.96	7.56	4.12	3.81	1.88	6.00	5.91
Important	47.31	39.26	44.04	40.34	34.02	40.95	20.66	33.50	37.76
Very important	43.46	52.48	49.54	50.42	61.86	55.24	77.46	60.00	55.78

Table 10. Library-Media Specialist Roles (con't)

How important is it that the ...	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
LMS instructs or consults with parents									
Unimportant	4.21	4.53	5.50	10.17	0.00	2.88	5.58	2.50	4.53
Somewhat important	38.31	27.57	38.07	36.44	20.62	24.04	25.58	24.00	30.29
Important	37.93	48.15	38.99	37.29	53.61	51.92	42.79	47.00	43.75
Very important	19.54	19.75	17.43	16.10	25.77	21.15	26.05	26.50	21.43
LMS works with teacher to develop objectives									
Unimportant	4.60	4.12	5.07	5.04	2.06	0.95	0.93	4.04	3.57
Somewhat important	22.61	19.75	23.04	30.25	16.49	22.86	10.23	24.75	20.89
Important	45.59	41.15	47.47	44.54	39.18	35.24	40.93	41.41	42.61
Very important	27.20	34.98	24.42	20.17	42.27	40.95	47.91	29.80	32.92

Table 10. Library-Media Specialist Roles (con't)

How important is it that the ...	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
LSM assists in delivering lesson or unit content and activities									
Unimportant	5.77	4.12	4.13	5.88	2.06	0.95	0.93	3.50	3.64
Somewhat important	19.23	15.64	22.02	26.89	12.37	19.05	10.70	28.50	19.22
Important	44.23	42.39	47.25	46.22	51.55	45.71	38.14	40.00	43.65
Very important	30.77	37.86	26.61	21.01	34.02	34.29	50.23	28.00	33.49
LMS works with teacher to plan for student assessment									
Unimportant	16.48	12.81	14.68	15.97	7.22	13.33	7.01	14.07	12.99
Somewhat important	30.27	36.36	33.03	36.13	34.02	26.67	26.17	31.66	31.75
Important	37.93	31.40	34.86	36.97	34.02	35.24	36.92	38.19	35.74
Very important	15.33	19.42	17.43	10.92	24.74	24.76	29.91	16.08	19.52

Table 11. Teacher and Library-Media Specialist Communications

How important is it that the ...	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
LMS and teacher have brief, unscheduled talks									
Unimportant	3.07	4.55	2.79	0.84	0.00	2.86	0.00	3.02	2.41
Somewhat important	24.14	19.01	16.28	21.01	18.56	19.05	5.14	24.12	18.32
Important	51.72	50.41	52.56	48.74	51.55	49.52	33.18	51.26	48.42
Very important	21.07	26.03	28.37	29.41	29.90	28.57	61.68	21.61	30.85
LMS and teacher schedule appointed times to talk									
Unimportant	10.69	11.16	9.68	10.17	1.04	6.67	1.86	3.52	7.36
Somewhat important	28.24	29.34	29.95	38.98	27.08	19.05	17.21	19.10	25.93
Important	42.75	40.08	41.01	34.75	43.75	44.76	36.74	48.24	41.47
Very important	18.32	19.42	19.35	16.10	28.13	29.52	44.19	29.15	25.24

Table 11. Teacher and Library-Media Specialist Communications (con't)

How important is it that the ...	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
LMS participates in team or grade level meetings									
Unimportant	5.77	4.55	4.17	2.52	0.00	2.88	0.93	3.02	3.38
Somewhat important	18.85	17.36	22.69	29.41	10.31	14.42	8.41	14.07	16.95
Important	48.08	45.87	45.83	44.54	45.36	45.19	31.31	41.71	43.35
Very important	27.31	32.23	27.31	23.53	44.33	37.50	59.35	41.21	36.32
LMS and teacher communicate through notes, memos, or other written communication									
Unimportant	1.91	4.53	0.93	1.68	0.00	2.86	0.47	2.01	1.92
Somewhat important	21.76	17.28	17.59	21.85	10.42	19.05	6.51	22.11	17.25
Important	52.67	46.91	52.31	49.58	56.25	50.48	39.07	51.76	49.35
Very important	23.66	31.28	29.17	26.89	33.33	27.62	53.95	24.12	31.48

Table 11. Teacher and Library-Media Specialist Communications (con't)

How important is it that the ...	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
LMS and teachers communicate as part of faculty meetings									
Unimportant	3.82	2.88	3.70	5.88	0.00	3.81	1.40	3.50	3.16
Somewhat important	13.36	11.52	18.06	25.21	12.37	18.10	10.23	19.50	15.37
Important	52.67	46.50	50.00	42.02	43.30	42.86	34.42	41.50	44.82
Very important	30.15	39.09	28.24	26.89	44.33	35.24	53.95	35.50	36.65
LMS and teachers meet during planning days when children are not in attendance									
Unimportant	6.98	7.50	4.65	3.36	3.09	4.76	2.35	3.02	4.77
Somewhat important	22.09	17.50	25.58	30.25	10.31	15.24	8.45	13.57	18.05
Important	44.19	43.33	43.26	47.90	45.36	49.52	35.68	40.20	42.88
Very important	26.74	31.67	26.51	18.49	41.24	30.48	53.52	43.22	34.30

Table 12. Experiences with Book Clubs

	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
How often do you participate in a book club with other adults?									
Never	64.23	64.37	57.27	46.61	59.18	48.60	51.39	47.78	56.16
Seldom	25.00	25.10	27.27	32.20	28.57	33.64	37.04	33.50	29.75
Frequently	9.62	7.29	10.91	16.10	10.20	12.15	8.33	14.29	10.62
Very frequently	1.15	3.24	4.55	5.08	2.04	5.61	3.24	4.43	3.47
How often do you use book clubs in your classroom?									
Never	40.46	19.84	35.45	60.68	46.51	32.35	62.38	37.76	40.42
Seldom	24.81	29.96	28.64	21.37	30.23	31.37	20.95	25.51	26.32
Frequently	20.99	33.60	24.09	16.24	18.60	30.39	11.43	27.04	23.19
Very frequently	13.74	16.60	11.82	1.71	4.65	5.88	5.24	9.69	10.07

Table 13. Beliefs about Book Clubs

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about book clubs?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Adult book clubs offer an important way to learn about literature									
Strongly disagree	2.35	2.05	1.84	4.46	2.04	2.91	1.90	2.50	2.36
Disagree	7.45	9.43	10.14	6.25	15.31	4.85	9.00	7.00	8.61
Agree	79.61	76.64	75.58	76.79	74.49	66.02	69.19	73.00	74.51
Strongly agree	10.59	11.89	12.44	12.50	8.16	26.21	19.91	17.50	14.51
Adult book clubs provide valuable insights into how people respond to literature									
Strongly disagree	2.38	2.06	1.39	4.46	2.06	0.99	1.42	3.08	2.17
Disagree	11.11	12.76	12.50	7.14	18.56	5.94	8.02	4.62	10.08
Agree	71.43	72.43	73.61	72.32	69.07	66.34	69.81	70.77	71.15
Strongly agree	15.08	12.76	12.50	16.07	10.31	26.73	20.75	21.54	16.60

Table 13. Beliefs about Book Clubs (con't)

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about book clubs?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
I am interested in belonging to a book club for adults									
Strongly disagree	16.47	17.43	17.37	14.16	25.53	11.88	19.05	14.21	16.92
Disagree	39.61	41.49	30.99	26.55	38.30	18.81	25.24	27.92	32.30
Agree	37.25	32.37	38.97	43.36	30.85	52.48	40.00	39.09	38.48
Strongly agree	6.67	8.71	12.68	15.93	5.32	16.83	15.71	18.78	12.29
Book clubs for children offer important ways to learn about literature									
Strongly disagree	0.39	0.82	0.47	1.75	2.08	0.00	0.94	2.03	0.97
Disagree	2.73	4.92	2.33	6.14	3.13	0.97	5.19	2.03	3.48
Agree	69.53	62.70	70.70	73.68	71.88	65.05	68.40	54.31	66.46
Strongly agree	27.34	31.56	26.51	18.42	22.92	33.98	25.47	41.62	29.09

Table 13. Beliefs about Book Clubs (con't)

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about book clubs?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Book clubs for children provide valuable insights into how children respond to literature									
Strongly disagree	1.54	0.82	0.92	0.92	3.06	0.00	0.95	1.52	1.18
Disagree	7.72	7.00	6.91	7.34	6.12	0.98	8.06	5.56	6.61
Agree	67.57	60.91	67.28	69.72	66.33	60.78	64.93	53.03	63.60
Strongly agree	23.17	31.28	24.88	22.02	24.49	38.24	26.07	39.90	28.60
I am interested in using book clubs with children									
Strongly disagree	4.28	3.32	8.84	11.61	11.83	2.91	11.76	11.17	7.78
Disagree	15.56	8.71	13.49	23.21	21.51	9.71	24.51	11.17	15.36
Agree	61.48	57.68	51.63	50.89	49.46	60.19	47.06	45.21	53.36
Strongly agree	18.68	30.29	26.05	14.29	17.20	27.18	16.67	32.45	23.50

Table 13. Beliefs about Book Clubs (con't)

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about book clubs?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Book clubs offer powerful tools to transform teaching									
Strongly disagree	2.76	2.53	3.30	5.50	5.43	1.00	1.00	5.10	3.14
Disagree	24.02	15.61	21.23	21.10	20.65	12.00	30.00	11.22	19.93
Agree	59.84	60.34	57.55	55.05	54.35	64.00	54.50	53.57	57.50
Strongly agree	13.39	21.52	17.92	18.35	19.57	23.00	14.50	30.10	19.43

Table 14. Practices with Book Clubs and Multicultural Literature

How often do you do the following:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Read books by or about people from other cultures in an adult book club									
Never	61.87	63.11	54.17	49.56	59.14	57.00	58.02	48.72	57.06
Seldom	25.68	26.64	27.78	28.32	26.88	24.00	25.94	29.23	26.85
Frequently	12.45	10.25	18.06	22.12	13.98	19.00	16.04	22.05	16.08
Discuss issues of cultural diversity in an adult book club									
Never	74.51	72.02	61.57	53.57	63.83	66.33	64.45	52.33	64.70
Seldom	20.00	20.58	25.93	29.46	23.40	19.39	24.64	27.46	23.63
Frequently	5.49	7.41	12.50	16.96	12.77	14.29	10.90	20.21	11.67
Encourage the reading of books by and about people of other cultures in book clubs for children									
Never	38.19	24.18	28.37	40.91	38.71	31.31	46.15	31.09	34.25
Seldom	23.62	29.92	28.37	21.82	37.63	31.31	20.67	17.62	25.49
Frequently	38.19	45.90	43.26	37.27	23.66	37.37	33.17	51.30	40.25

Table 14. Practices with Book Clubs and Multicultural Literature (con't)

How often do you do the following:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Discuss issues of cultural diversity in book clubs for children									
Never	40.08	26.45	36.15	51.82	45.65	37.76	55.34	35.42	39.86
Seldom	25.00	29.75	31.46	20.00	35.87	26.53	21.84	20.83	26.19
Frequently	34.92	43.80	32.39	28.18	18.48	35.71	22.82	43.75	33.95
Select multicultural literature as part of an instructional theme or unit									
Never	10.08	9.05	9.22	9.57	25.00	11.00	13.04	10.50	11.24
Seldom	19.38	26.34	26.27	27.83	29.35	20.00	18.84	10.50	21.65
Frequently	70.54	64.61	64.52	62.61	45.65	69.00	68.12	79.00	67.11

Table 15. Experiences with Portfolio Assessment

I have had experience with:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Portfolios designed by someone other than the teacher and students	9.09	13.30	10.38	9.43	9.89	9.62	4.39	9.47	9.47
Portfolios designed by a teacher <u>for</u> his or her students	43.08	28.33	23.11	38.68	28.57	41.35	15.61	21.05	29.12
Portfolios designed by a teacher <u>and</u> his or her students	18.58	26.18	27.36	24.53	35.16	25.96	13.66	46.32	26.33
Portfolios designed primarily <u>by the students</u>	3.16	6.01	7.55	5.66	12.09	3.85	7.80	17.37	7.75
I have no experience with portfolio assessment	26.09	26.18	31.60	21.70	14.29	19.23	58.54	5.79	27.33

Table 16. Interest in Portfolio Assessment

How interested are you in the use of portfolio assessment in the classroom?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Not interested	9.73	10.93	12.33	4.31	2.06	4.85	21.50	3.40	9.87
Somewhat interested	28.40	27.53	32.88	36.21	21.65	21.36	41.12	9.71	27.83
Interested	33.46	37.25	31.05	21.55	28.87	35.92	27.10	28.64	31.05
Very interested	28.40	24.29	23.74	37.93	47.42	37.86	10.28	58.25	31.25

Table 17. Influences on Portfolio Practices

My practice has been influenced by:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Reading about portfolio assessment									
Strongly disagree	3.50	6.53	5.12	5.08	3.06	2.88	10.68	1.94	5.11
Disagree	9.73	10.61	10.23	11.86	9.18	7.69	12.62	2.91	9.39
Agree	46.69	48.98	51.16	41.53	43.88	53.85	38.35	33.98	44.65
Strongly agree	28.02	24.08	20.93	29.66	37.76	28.85	7.77	59.22	28.71
Not applicable	12.06	9.80	12.56	11.86	6.12	6.73	30.58	1.94	12.15
Attending staff development or conference presentations or workshops on portfolio assessment									
Strongly disagree	3.52	4.44	5.53	5.08	2.04	0.96	9.71	3.90	4.75
Disagree	10.94	6.45	9.22	12.71	8.16	8.65	9.71	10.73	9.50
Agree	41.02	39.52	36.87	32.20	39.80	42.31	32.52	34.63	37.33
Strongly agree	28.52	34.27	29.49	33.05	39.80	37.50	11.65	40.00	30.65
Not applicable	16.02	15.32	18.89	16.95	10.20	10.58	36.41	10.73	17.77

Table 17. Influences on Portfolio Practices (con't)

My practice has been influenced by:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Creating my own portfolio to fulfill college or university course requirements									
Strongly disagree	12.89	12.10	15.96	13.68	9.47	9.62	16.10	7.88	12.56
Disagree	21.48	21.77	15.96	18.80	23.16	15.38	15.12	15.27	18.39
Agree	16.02	22.58	17.37	15.38	16.84	16.35	13.66	19.21	17.49
Strongly agree	6.25	8.87	10.33	6.84	14.74	14.42	4.88	25.12	10.96
Not applicable	43.36	34.68	40.38	45.30	35.79	44.23	50.24	32.51	40.60
Implementing portfolio assessment with the students I teach									
Strongly disagree	5.84	6.10	8.49	5.08	7.29	3.85	13.66	3.41	6.93
Disagree	10.89	9.35	8.96	6.78	11.46	4.81	13.66	3.90	9.01
Agree	14.40	19.51	16.04	16.10	16.67	21.15	10.24	19.02	16.35
Strongly agree	50.19	49.19	43.87	55.08	29.17	47.12	10.73	67.32	44.70
Not applicable	18.68	15.85	22.64	16.95	35.42	23.08	51.71	6.34	23.01

Table 17. Influences on Portfolio Practices (con't)

My practice has been influenced by:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Creating a teacher portfolio to document my growth as a literacy professional									
Strongly disagree	11.33	11.74	14.42	14.66	7.45	7.69	14.98	6.86	11.50
Disagree	21.88	21.46	16.28	21.55	21.28	14.42	13.53	14.71	18.16
Agree	20.31	23.08	22.79	14.66	19.15	15.38	14.49	25.98	20.24
Strongly agree	9.38	7.29	10.70	8.62	18.09	16.35	7.25	26.96	12.40
Not applicable	37.11	36.44	35.81	40.52	34.04	46.15	49.76	25.49	37.70

Table 18. Beliefs About Portfolio Assessment

	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Portfolios allow teachers to pay attention to process and progress instead of a final outcome									
Strongly disagree	1.92	3.28	1.89	0.86	0.00	0.94	1.95	0.98	1.73
Disagree	5.77	8.20	8.49	7.76	2.04	1.89	6.83	7.35	6.57
Agree	44.62	52.46	51.42	52.59	58.16	50.94	50.24	36.76	48.65
Strongly agree	41.92	29.51	28.77	35.34	39.80	41.51	21.46	52.94	35.85
Not applicable	5.77	6.56	9.43	3.45	0.00	4.72	19.51	1.96	7.20
Portfolio assessment should replace other measures of assessment and evaluation (e.g. standardized tests, grades, etc.)									
Strongly disagree	15.65	16.39	17.45	12.71	12.37	9.71	11.33	6.34	13.23
Disagree	41.98	54.51	49.53	44.07	59.79	62.14	46.80	51.22	50.00
Agree	21.76	16.80	16.98	27.12	19.59	15.53	18.23	22.93	19.74
Strongly agree	14.12	6.97	7.08	11.86	8.25	6.80	4.93	15.61	9.70
Not applicable	6.49	5.33	8.96	4.24	0.00	5.83	18.72	3.90	7.34

Table 18. Beliefs About Portfolio Assessment (con't)

	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Portfolio assessment effectively documents growth over time									
Strongly disagree	1.53	3.27	1.41	0.85	0.00	0.96	2.45	0.98	1.66
Disagree	4.98	9.39	6.57	2.54	4.12	9.62	5.88	4.41	6.09
Agree	48.28	54.29	58.22	57.63	56.70	45.19	54.41	45.59	52.35
Strongly agree	38.70	26.53	24.88	34.75	39.18	39.42	18.63	46.57	32.64
Not applicable	6.51	6.53	8.92	4.24	0.00	4.81	18.63	2.45	7.26
Portfolio assessment is a means for gaining valuable knowledge about instructional practice									
Strongly disagree	3.07	4.07	2.35	0.85	0.00	0.96	2.44	0.50	2.14
Disagree	12.26	11.38	12.68	11.02	6.19	5.77	8.78	4.46	9.61
Agree	51.34	53.66	52.11	57.63	52.58	58.65	53.66	39.60	51.66
Strongly agree	27.20	22.76	24.41	25.42	41.24	29.81	16.10	51.98	28.91
Not applicable	6.13	8.13	8.45	5.08	0.00	4.81	19.02	3.47	7.68

Table 18. Beliefs About Portfolio Assessment (con't)

	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Teachers can effectively demonstrate portfolio processes by creating their own portfolios									
Strongly disagree	2.35	2.87	2.83	0.00	0.00	1.90	1.97	1.97	2.02
Disagree	10.59	11.48	14.15	11.02	2.04	8.57	9.36	5.91	9.74
Agree	55.69	56.56	50.00	64.41	64.29	55.24	49.26	45.81	53.96
Strongly agree	21.57	18.03	20.75	18.64	33.67	25.71	17.24	42.36	24.06
Not applicable	9.80	11.07	12.26	5.93	0.00	8.57	22.17	3.94	10.22
Portfolios are more useful as learning tools than as assessment tools									
Strongly disagree	4.63	3.25	3.29	0.87	2.06	3.88	2.51	4.46	3.35
Disagree	40.54	33.74	31.92	29.57	34.02	36.89	29.65	41.58	35.15
Agree	32.05	36.99	41.78	43.48	40.21	40.78	36.18	31.19	36.89
Strongly agree	16.99	18.29	13.15	19.13	20.62	12.62	10.05	19.80	16.18
Not applicable	5.79	7.72	9.86	6.96	3.09	5.83	21.61	2.97	8.44

Table 19. Beliefs About Teaching Literacy

	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Literacy should be taught as a source of entertainment									
Strongly disagree	3.45	2.83	1.85	1.71	0.00	5.71	3.27	0.98	2.53
Disagree	9.20	10.53	12.04	10.26	19.39	9.52	14.02	9.31	11.35
Agree	55.56	48.99	50.93	48.72	53.06	48.57	42.99	53.43	50.41
Strongly agree	31.80	37.65	35.19	39.32	27.55	36.19	39.72	36.27	35.70
Literacy should be taught as a skill to be learned									
Strongly disagree	3.45	1.64	0.92	0.00	2.04	2.94	1.40	11.33	3.16
Disagree	13.41	14.34	9.22	11.02	8.16	19.61	9.81	26.60	14.14
Agree	55.94	52.05	57.60	54.24	59.18	48.04	50.93	43.84	52.64
Strongly agree	27.20	31.97	32.26	34.75	30.61	29.41	37.85	18.23	30.06

Table 19. Beliefs About Teaching Literacy (con't)

	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Literacy should be taught as an integral ingredient of our everyday lives									
Strongly disagree	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.94	0.47	0.00	0.20
Disagree	0.38	1.21	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.41
Agree	29.01	24.70	28.57	22.88	29.59	18.87	23.72	18.54	24.80
Strongly agree	70.23	74.09	70.97	77.12	70.41	80.19	75.35	81.46	74.59

Table 20. Home and School Involvement in Learning

Extent of home or school involvement in learning:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Learning about what is right and wrong									
1. Home only	2.28	1.60	0.46	0.84	1.02	1.89	2.78	0.98	1.56
2.	22.81	27.60	28.11	29.41	20.41	26.42	28.24	24.39	26.05
3. Home/school equal	70.72	67.60	69.12	63.03	71.43	67.92	64.81	71.22	68.39
4.	4,18	3.20	2.30	6.72	7.14	3.77	4.17	3.41	4.00
5. School only	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Learning about the physical world (food, human body, seasons, machines, TV, transportation, etc.)									
1. Home only	0.38	0.40	0.91	1.68	0.00	0.00	0.93	0.49	0.61
2.	4.17	1.60	6.85	5.88	2.04	2.86	5.12	3.43	4.07
3. Home/school equal	70.08	77.20	72.15	70.59	74.49	77.14	66.51	69.61	71.85
4.	24.24	20.40	19.18	21.01	23.47	19.05	26.98	25.98	22.80
5. School only	1.14	0.40	0.91	0.84	0.00	0.95	0.47	0.49	0.68

Table 20. Home and School Involvement in Learning (con't)

Extent of home or school involvement in learning:	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Learning to communicate effectively with others									
1. Home only	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.49	0.14
2.	3.79	1.60	4.57	5.04	1.03	2.83	1.86	1.95	2.85
3. Home/school equal	81.06	85.20	77.63	73.95	82.47	71.70	79.07	78.05	79.39
4.	14.77	12.80	17.81	19.33	16.49	24.53	19.07	18.54	17.22
5. School only	0.38	0.40	0.00	0.84	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.98	0.41
Learning to read and write									
1. Home only	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.49	0.07
2.	0.76	0.00	2.76	3.36	2.06	1.90	0.93	0.49	1.29
3. Home/school equal	60.61	65.06	62.67	59.66	57.73	56.19	51.16	59.51	59.55
4.	36.74	33.73	33.64	34.45	38.14	39.05	46.98	37.07	37.39
5. School only	1.89	1.20	0.92	2.52	2.06	2.86	0.93	2.44	1.70

Table 21. Interest in Gender Issues

How interested are you in knowing about gender issues in literacy education?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Not interested	15.65	19.03	17.51	13.45	17.35	7.55	11.16	6.76	13.94
Somewhat interested	36.26	31.98	26.27	30.25	26.53	41.51	33.49	23.67	31.14
Interested	35.11	33.20	39.17	35.29	30.61	33.02	33.02	36.71	34.87
Very interested	12.98	15.79	17.05	21.01	25.51	17.92	22.33	32.85	20.05

Table 22. Determinants of Behavior

The behavior of boys and girls is primarily determined by ...	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Biological and physiological determinants 1	1.18	0.40	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48
2	4.31	2.43	6.48	2.54	3.16	4.85	3.79	2.45	3.80
3	59.22	58.70	47.69	51.69	51.58	61.17	51.66	45.59	53.42
4	30.20	28.74	38.43	40.68	42.11	31.07	39.81	43.63	36.16
Social and cultural determinants 5	5.10	9.72	6.02	5.08	3.16	2.91	4.74	8.33	6.14

Table 23. Gender and Teaching Scenarios

Assume you are a middle or high school teacher. How likely is it that you would engage in the following teaching scenarios?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Select a passage from a short story and ask students to examine it for sexist language									
Would never do this	17.37	17.81	12.27	2.52	7.37	8.74	9.26	3.92	11.14
Unlikely to do this	27.03	27.13	25.91	22.69	33.68	29.13	26.39	15.69	25.43
Might do this	39.38	40.49	43.18	57.14	47.37	47.57	43.52	48.04	44.50
Very much like to do this	16.22	14.57	18.64	17.65	11.58	14.56	20.83	32.35	18.93
Have students read Archie comic books to find out what messages the text and illustrations communicate about males and females									
Would never do this	10.04	14.11	11.87	10.08	5.26	8.82	12.50	6.90	10.54
Unlikely to do this	31.66	29.84	31.05	26.89	36.84	31.37	26.39	21.67	29.02
Might do this	42.08	39.11	42.47	52.94	48.42	43.14	44.91	41.87	43.39
Very much like to do this	16.22	16.94	14.61	10.08	9.47	16.67	16.20	29.56	17.04

Table 23. Gender and Teaching Scenarios (con't)

Assume you are a middle or high school teacher. How likely is it that you would engage in the following teaching scenarios?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Have students read an excerpt from Harper Lee's To Kill a Mockingbird and ask students to think about what it meant to be a man in the 1930's									
Would never do this	2.70	2.82	4.09	0.85	1.05	0.99	1.39	1.97	2.26
Unlikely to do this	10.81	8.87	8.64	0.85	6.32	4.95	9.26	7.39	7.95
Might do this	49.81	52.02	46.82	45.76	51.58	55.45	51.85	43.35	49.32
Very much like to do this	36.68	36.29	40.45	52.54	41.05	38.61	37.50	47.29	40.48
Have students read about a woman who builds a cabin and lives a solitary life in the woods and then think of questions that you would like to ask her									
Would never do this	1.16	0.81	1.83	0.00	1.05	0.00	1.85	1.97	1.23
Unlikely to do this	5.41	5.65	4.57	4.24	3.16	2.91	6.02	6.40	5.13
Might do this	47.10	46.77	44.75	57.63	54.74	45.63	54.17	37.93	47.71
Very much like to do this	46.33	46.77	48.86	38.14	41.05	51.46	37.96	53.69	45.93

Table 23. Gender and Teaching Scenarios (con't)

Assume you are a middle or high school teacher. How likely is it that you would engage in the following teaching scenarios?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Encourage discussion in which girls identify with female characters and boys with male characters									
Would never do this	5.43	6.05	7.34	5.08	4.21	5.83	7.51	9.50	6.61
Unlikely to do this	31.01	29.44	32.11	39.83	28.42	33.98	35.21	36.50	33.04
Might do this	45.74	50.40	42.20	40.68	53.68	38.83	44.13	34.50	43.84
Very much like to do this	17.83	14.11	18.35	14.41	13.68	21.36	13.15	19.50	16.52
Monitor whether male and female students participate equally in class discussions of reading assignments									
Would never do this	3.47	2.86	3.64	1.71	1.05	0.97	2.31	0.99	2.40
Unlikely to do this	13.13	12.24	13.64	13.68	9.47	15.53	15.28	7.39	12.55
Might do this	46.72	49.39	41.36	45.30	51.58	46.60	49.07	39.90	45.95
Very much like to do this	36.68	35.51	41.36	39.32	37.89	36.89	33.33	51.72	39.09

Table 23. Gender and Teaching Scenarios (con't)

Assume you are a middle or high school teacher. How likely is it that you would engage in the following teaching scenarios?	TCH K-2	TCH 3-5	TCH 6-8	TCH 9-12	ADM	RDG SPC	LMS	TCH EDU	ALL
Include in the curriculum the writings, ideas, and accomplishments of women and men not considered part of the mainstream									
Would never do this	2.70	2.82	2.29	0.85	0.00	0.97	0.46	0.98	1.64
Unlikely to do this	11.97	13.31	11.47	6.78	8.42	5.83	9.26	5.39	9.72
Might do this	48.26	51.21	45.87	48.31	47.37	54.37	53.24	36.27	47.84
Very much like to do this	37.07	32.66	40.37	44.07	44.21	38.83	37.04	57.35	40.79

NRRC National
Reading Research
Center

318 Aderhold, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602-7125
3216 J. M. Patterson Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742